DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 128 EA 001 743

By-Blackmon, C. Robert, Ed.
Selected Papers on Values.
University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette.
Pub Date Aug 68
Note-109p.; Papers collected by the Continuing Interest Group on Values from sessions of the Nat. Conf. of Professors of Educ. Admin.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.55
Descriptors-*Administrative Personnel, Administrator Role, *Educational Administration, *Educational Philosophy, Educational Psychology, *Leadership Responsibility, Mental Health, Motivation, Perception, School Administration, Social Change, Statistical Surveys, Urban Schools, *Values

This document contains papers and reports read at the August 1968, meeting of the Continuing Interest Group on Values, a subgroup of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, held at the State University of New York at Albany. Included are three papers by C. Robert Blackmon; the first considers values as education's most neglected problem, the second is a report of the 1967 meeting, and the third is a report of data from a survey of professors of educational administration concerning values. Other papers include: "Value Problems of the Urban School Administrator," by Charles A. Bird; "Values, Perception and Leadership Behavior," by Benjamin M. Sachs; "Some Implications of Social Change for the Public School Administrator," by Edward T. Ladd; and "The Relevance of Values to Psychological Health," by Richard E. Worthen. (JK)

# SELECTED PAPERS ON VALUES

edited by

C. Robert Blackmon

Associate Professor of Education
University of Southwestern Louisiana

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, Louisiana 70501

August, 1968

Dr. C. Robert Blackmon
Recording Secretary of the
Continuing Interest Group on Values of the
National Conference of Professors
of Educational Administration

1206 Lee Avenue
Lafayette, Louisiana 70501

Continuing Interest Group on Values

CHAIRMAN

Dr. Benjamin M. Sachs
Professor of Educational Administration
Sacramento State College
6000 Jay Street
Sacramento, California 95819

## FOREWORD

Representative of heredity, environment, and experience, the three overlapped triangles above represent the interrelationships of those three factors as a values construct and serve as a symbol for the identification of communications by and from the members of the Continuing Interest Group on Values.

The Continuing Interest Group on Values, a sub-group of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, will hold its fourth two-session meeting at the State University of New York at Albany on August 20 and 22, 1968, to consider -- among other things -- the papers presented in this booklet. At the Nineteenth NCPEA Conference the Continuing Interest Group on Values first met and opened dialog on values as an area of interest to professors of educational administration. At the Twentieth NCPEA Conference at the University of Indiana the Group explored "Values in School Administration" in terms of the implications of that topic for the preparation of school administrators and for practicing administrators. At the 1968 meetings in Tucson the Group explored "Personality, Perception and Values in Educational Administration," and this booklet is an outgrowth of those sessions.

It is the intent of the Continuing Interest Group on Values to sensitize educators, particularly practicing administrators and NCPEA members, to values as a problem area. The Group is pleased by the recognition of the importance of this problem area by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and proud that Dr. Gale Rose, a member of the Group, has been appointed Chairman of a committee to study values in schools in the United States (a sub-committee of the AACTE Committee on Studies).

At this writing there is reason to believe that the work of the Continuing Interest Group on Values will continue for several years. NCPEA members and persons not members of NCPEA are welcome to react to these papers or submit papers of their own for use in future publications. The Group expects to produce a newsletter intermittently and, perhaps, a semi-annual or quarterly journal. Interested persons should contact Dr. Blackmon to get on the mailing list.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

VALUES

C. Robert Blackmon 1

BEAUTY IS IN ALL OF US - (Poem)

Benjamin M. Sachs 18

VALUE PROBLEMS OF THE URBAN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR

Charles A. Bird 19

VALUES, PERCEPTION AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

Benjamin M. Sachs 26

SOME IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL CHANGE FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR

Edward T. Ladd 54

THE RELEVANCE OF VALUES TO PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH

Richard E. Worthen 70

NOTES FROM THE TWO SESSIONS OF THE CONTINUING INTEREST GROUP ON VALUES, TUSCON, ARIZONA, AUGUST 1967

C. Robert Blackmon 81

A PRELIMINARY REPORT OF DATA FROM A SURVEY OF PROFESSORS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION CONCERNING VALUES

C. Robert Blackmon 84

# VALUES

C. Robert Blackmon

Associate Professor of Education
The University of Southwestern Louisiana

(Notes prepared for the Continuing Interest Group on Values of the Twenty-first National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, August 20 - 26, 1967.)

As students, teachers, and now as professors of educational administration, we are all aware of the frequency with which reference has been made to values in the materials with which we have been concerned almost daily. Yet, an explicit indication in those materials as to what values are is found rarely. Hence, the following paper is submitted as an invitation to dialog and further investigation rather than as an attempt to circumscribe a topic so pervasive in and important to educational administration.

## I. VALUES ARE PERVASIVE

No administrative decision is value free. For that reason we need to add strength to our social and philosophical foundations of school administration. But, as the literature cited in the bibliography prepared for this paper will indicate, the investigation of both the general problems of value judgments in education and interpretations of those judgments in educational contexts is becoming increasingly sophisticated. Perhaps, unfortunately, less study has been devoted to the implications of systems of philosophy for problems of value than has been given to the general considerations of value in terms of interpreting value in the context of particular educational problems.

Perhaps such sophistication is appropriate, for certainly the interrelationships between perception, personality, culture, and values are complex. Worthen puts the complexity this way:

> The psychologist and derivatively the educator who is interested not only in looking and understanding, but also in mental health, is concerned with reshaping, altering, and amending. His aim is not only diagnosis but also therapeutic activity in a broad category. Successful personality functioning requires the self to take care of value changes fostered at a rapid rate in our culture. When an individual is required to give up or exchange values, his personality mechanisms are involved. Successful value adjustment is essentially the personality's ability to make compromises. Not all compromises are directed toward optimum functioning, and the number of compromises one is capable of making is limited. Some values are so fundamental to a particular personality structure that any attempt to compromise seems to do considerable damage. (57: 9)

Thus, if the goal of liberative education is to free the individual from rigid, habitual, or biased modes of thought, to help him to explore many realms of knowledge and activity, and lead him to cherish the pleasures and responsibilities of such freedoms, a liberally educated person is one who has examined or begun to examine his own values or those of society, in order to judge which ones are important or worthy of support. (57: 9-10) Or, as Gale Rose put it (40), he has begun the process of switching from a traditional to an emergent basis for identifying his individual values -- or of synthesizing the best in each for himself.

## II. THE PROBLEM

In this study a very cursory attempt has been made to consider the question, What are values? It was assumed that values exist and that they have an important bearing upon the behavior of the individual. Their importance is seen in their relation to educational objectives in the public school systems of this country. But, values are not easily defined. Doris Campbell attempted to do so by turning to experimental literature. (8: 61) But, that source did not produce anything of great worth because it soon became evident to Campbell that values are what the tests of values measure. Or, to put it as Arnstine (1: 158-67) argues it, the act of measuring values reduces them to evaluations. Hence, values may be defined operationally (outcome of the measuring instruments), as theoretical constructs, or perhaps as intervening variables (ways to live). Unfortunately, none of these approaches singly have seemed to result in a preciseness or exactness of meaning that is to be desired.

## III. MEASUREMENT OF VALUES

Significant attempts to apply measurement to values have been made in quantity too numerous to cite here. However, several are worthy of mention. According to Doris Campbell, the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey _Study of Values_ is probably the best measuring instrument in the field of values. (8: 62) Also, Friedman's _Foundations of the Measurement of_

Values is a classic piece of work. After exploring theories of value and reviewing major principles and processes in measurement, the author tackles the problems of locating and measuring values. Some of these are whether or not overt behavior and verbal statements are adequate indices of value, whether or not values can be quantified and what kinds of scales are appropriate for measuring values. (11: 283)

## IV. VALUES AND PHILOSOPHY

But, inescapably, also, the study of values involves philosophy. And as H. A. Overstreet put it in "Finding Our Philosophy" (The Thinker 4: 12; September, 1931):

> The totality of one's loyalties is one's philosophy of life. This, I think, is the simplest and most useful way in which to define that frequently misunderstood term. A philosophy of life is one's world outlook. It is the way in which one regards things, events, relationships, the values one sets upon them. This individual, for example, sets a very high value upon the acquisition of money and a very low one upon an equitable sharing with others. Such valuation is part of his philosophy of life. To another this philosophy may be something to be despised. The high value to him may be a life of shared possessions, the low value of life mere private acquisition.
>
> It is clear from the above that the most powerful factor or force in one's life is one's philosophy. One does a multitude of different things. The knowledge of how to do each thing is indeed important--how to add a column of figures, how to run a motor car, how to invest in the right kind of securities. But by far the most important of all is the system of values which determines what things one will do and not do. One's philosophy of life, in short, is one's fundamental principle of choice. It is that which most deeply and enduringly determines what one is to select out of the heterogeneity of existence. Without a principle of choice there is chaos.

John Dewey and John L. Childs (29: 15) delved even more deeply into the principle of choice:

It is the business of a philosophy of education to make clear what is involved in the action which is carried on within the educational field, to transform a preference which is blind, based on custom rather than on thought, into an intelligent choice -- one made, that is, with consciousness of what is aimed at, the reasons why it is preferred, and the fitness of the means used. Nevertheless, intelligent choice is still choice. It still involves preference for one kind of end rather than another one which might have been worked for. It involves a conviction that such and such an end is valuable, worthwhile, rather than another. Sincerity demands a maximum of impartiality in seeking and stating the reasons for the aims and the values which are chosen and reflected. But the scheme of education itself cannot be impartial in the sense of not involving a preference for some values over others. The obligation to be impartial is the obligation to state as clearly as possible what is chosen and why it is chosen.

## V. DEFINITIONS

With the above considerations in mind, let us look at a few brief definitions in order to get some idea of the range and diversity in the literature. Edward L. Thorndike (29: 142) said,

> Things are not good and bad for no reason. Better and worse, worthy and harmful, right and wrong, have meaning only in reference to conscious beings whose lives can be made more satisfying or more bearable.
>
> A thing or event or act or condition is not, in the last analysis, desirable because it is valuable. It is valuable because it is desirable -- because it satisfies a want or craving or impulse of some man or other conscious being. . . .
>
> Value or worth or the good means power to satisfy wants.

Bertrand Russell (46) asserted:

> . . . when we assert that this or that has value, we are giving expression to our own emotions, not to a fact which would still be true if our personal feelings were different. Since no way can be even imagined for deciding a difference as to values, the conclusion is forced upon us that the difference is one of tastes, not one as to any objective truths.

And Edgar S. Brightman (7) held, "By a value (or worth or good) is meant whatever is desired, or enjoyed, or prized, or approved, or preferred." According to Dewitt H. Parker (36), "Value is the satisfaction of any interest in any object." Wilbur Urban (53) believed that "Value is that which satisfies human desire, furthers or conserves life, and leads to the development of selves, or to self-realization." R. M. MacIver (32) expressed a definition of values indirectly as "The concept of the desirable, and its comparative, that of progress, is never absent from human affairs. All conduct implies a consciousness of welfare, of less and greater welfare--we could neither live nor act without it. To live is to act, and to act is to choose, and to choose is to evaluate."

In short, then, a value is a motivating force, a selecting factor, an appraising concept which enables us to make choices among alternative paths of action. Values are decisive agents in formulating hypotheses and judging consequences. A value might be said to be the comparative weight, esteem, or price attached by the individual to a given idea, person, or object. Thus, values may be defined, in one sense, as standards of judgment in human behavior and intimately related to what the individual has come to accept as guiding principles for living. (17)

## VI. SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

As reported in the February, 1964, issue of The Review of Educational Research, p. 34, Smith (48: 27-32) sought the limit of usefulness of the "is-ought" dichotomy and found it by stating that the dichotomy is used to distinguish between two intents or functions of language rather than between two types of statements. These intents or functions are the place that a given statement has in an overall pattern of action -- and any given statement of belief (i. e., factual statement) gives only contextually important aspects of the belief and not the full-blown belief with all of its affective, logical, and predictive overtones. The underlying belief, Smith held, remains undifferentiated with respect to fact (is) or value (ought). When one attempts to push beyond the intent of the statement in a given context, the dichotomy is no longer useful. On the basis of this picture, Smith's conclusion is that there is no reason based on intellectual judgment for concluding that oughts of various types -- "prudential, judicial, and even categorical" -- are necessarily byeond the reach of "theoretical-empirical research and development." Thus, Smith held (49: 293-308) that the old dichotomies, fact-value, belief-attitude, etc., that have controlled inquiry into problems of values for years may have lost this significance and that present inquirers would be better to attempt a "Retroductive" construction of value theory complex enough both to account for data and to be coherent.

Values are not static; they do grow and change. How or how much they change is not quite as certain. However, as individuals mature, their values become a component of their total personality. As they assess their ways of living, they sometimes reach the conclusion that it is necessary for them to effect a positive change concerning their value system. (17) Many authorities have agreed that changes may be effected in people's values and value systems through one or more of the following processes:

1. Reflective thinking
2. Cultural conditioning
3. Association of something with love and approval
4. Emotional experiences
5. Satisfaction or thwarting of physiological drives
6. Reward and punishment
7. Inculcation by authority.

The connection between the list above and 1984 seems, to this author, very real. But, even in that work, the changing of values was not one hundred per cent successful. In Changing Values in College, Phillip Jacob reported that there was no appreciable changes in the values of students studied over their four-year college experience. (8: 63) There were, however, Doris Campbell found, highly significant differences in the means of the values themselves. This suggests a highly significant patterning of students' values, which depend very likely upon the actual objectives of the institution studied and which depend especially upon the culture of the community or area from which the students come.

In a study of students in Fundamentalist day schools, Erickson (16: 1-4) reported no differences in religiousness (conformity to Fundamentalist expectations) that could be attributed to differences in schooling. Despite purported global differences between public and private schools, the impact of schooling upon students' religious values was nil.

Some of the literature seems to support the assertion that values are hierarchial in nature. According to Henry (26: 442-53), the significance of one's hierarchy of value orientations in any interactive relationship can be described. He indicates that this hierarchy of individual value orientations has been the focus of several studies of principals' and superintendents' values. That the hierarchy differs with the individual is apparent in the work of Goldman (19: 1-4), for he found systematic differences among parents, educators, and high school students regarding both the qualities that the typical high school student should possess and the qualities that he actually possesses. Price (37) examined the impact of school upon the value orientations of teachers and of students. As a result of administering measures of values and attitudes to principals and teachers in eight suburban Chicago schools, Price found little evidence of change in values over a seven-month period; moreover, there was no indication that school principals had any effect upon changing the teachers' values or attitudes.

The impact of individual values upon working relationships existing between incumbents of complementary organizational roles also has been subjected to empirical test. Rasmussen (39: 1-12) found a high degree of actual agreement between principals and teachers on values in regard to teaching; yet teachers tended to perceive their principals as holding much less liberal views than their own. Rasmussen concluded that such discrepancies pose a potential threat to creative teaching.

Yet, Turk (52: 28-37) discovered that variations in types of values may create, rather than inhibit, social cohesion within an organization. In a study of working relationships between student physicians and student nurses, Turk found that the more bureaucratic the physician, the more likely he was to expect the nurse's role to be important, wide in scope, and autonomous; moreover, the more nonbureaucratic the nurse, the more likely she was to expect a role that was important, wide in scope, and autonomous of the physician's authority. Thus, the greatest team cohesion occurred when superordinate and subordinate role incumbents within an organization held different value orientations.

In an interesting experimental project, "The Effectiveness of an Integrated Student Government Program in Teaching Democratic Values to Elementary School Pupils," the State Board of Education of Utah concluded (p. 3, Educational Research Monograph No. 17-6265, February, 1966) that "As far as the project changing the overall behavior of the boys and girls in the school, it was unsuccessful. Boys and girls learned to talk tolerance but did not overcome the prejudice of the home environment in their actions." Or, as the late Marie Rasey was so fond of saying, "Re-thinking [in the sense of resultant and relatively permanent modification of behavior] is very difficult!"

Some interesting study of values in regard to educational leadership has been conducted in the series of studies done with the W. K. Kellogg Foundation grants through the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. (27: 31-32)

## VII. AXIOLOGY AND THE SCHOOL

In the Report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends, Recent Social Trends in the United States, p. lxxv, the following statement seems to sum up the present state of our society: "The clarification of human values and their reformulation in order to give expression to them in terms of today's life and opportunities is a major task of social thinking. The progressive confusion created in men's minds by the bewildering sweep of events revealed in our recent social trends must find its counterpart in the progressive clarification of men's thinking and feeling, in their reorientation to the meaning of the new trends." This profound statement appeared in 1933, not 1968.

In its A Guide: Teaching Moral and Spiritual Values in Florida's Schools, a select committee of educators makes the following assertion:

> It is generally assumed that one of the purposes of education is to transmit the culture of a particular civilization by familiarizing the learner with the culture in which he is being educated. It is logical, then, that the school has a responsibility to reflect and help preserve the foundations upon which its culture rests.
>
> Our culture, like that of other civilizations, is built upon a certain set of values. Although the values of our culture may vary from individual to individual, there are certain basic commonalities underlying all of these values. One of the most critical factors in the survival of any society has always been its ability to transmit effectively its values and principles to the succeeding generation. Therefore, it becomes a responsibility of our American schools to develop values -- an obligation which is shared with the home, church, synagogue, the community, and its various agencies.

As stated by Rev. Charles Conovan (10: 19),

> We have to come to appreciate with Havighurst that the values schools should promote -- such as orderliness, inhibition of aggressive impulses, a rational approach to a problem situation, desire for a work career based on skill and knowledge, desire for a stable family life, and desire for freedom for self and others -- are not class values but have equal validity for slum and suburb. It is true that middle class suburban families are more apt to support these values than lower class families; and so more emphasis on them and more work with parents is needed in inner-city schools. The teaching of fundamental values basic to adequate living in a democratic technological society will occupy a significant place in schools and schools of education in the future, and sociology

will have a significant role here, because, however one may feel about it, there is more likelihood of wide consensus on values empirically established by sociology than on values presented a priori by axiology.

## VIII. VALUES ARE EDUCATION'S MOST NEGLECTED PROBLEM

In Education as Power, Theodore Brameld (5: 102) concludes the chapter on values as follows:

> I therefore conclude this chapter with a plea for the axiologizing of public education as a whole. The time indeed is already well passed when we can afford to indulge in the luxury of cluttering curriculums, in spurious academic aloofness rationalized in moral conduct, and in stultifying ambitions to grasp the dubious goals of success and status at whatever cost to our personal and communal integrity. For the grim truth is that nothing less than the life of mankind as a whole is now in precarious balance. To reassert that values are education's most neglected problem is to insist . . . that we no longer have any genuine choice--no choice but to bring the nature and meaning of values out of the shadowy background and into the spotlight of sustained concern on every level of learning from kindergarten through the university.

William Heard Kilpatrick (29: vi) opens his book on educational philosophy with the significant quotation from Alfred North Whitehead, "A clash of doctrine is not a disaster -- it is an opportunity." We never had so much opportunity! For as Cuber and Harper (12) so neatly stated the case, we have issues when we have values in conflict. One has only to read the newspaper headlines to wonder if we have missed the opportunity irretrievably.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arnstine, Donald G., "Some Problems in Teaching Values," *Educational Theory* 11: 158-67 (July 1961).

2. Bacchetti, Raymond, "Experimentalist Value Theory in American Culture," in the *Proceedings* of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, edited by Robert E. Mason (Lawrence: E. E. Bayles, University of Kansas, 1961), pp. 76-81.

3. Blackmon, Bob (C. Robert), "Inner Space: the Ultimate Frontier," *Florida Education* 28: 6-8, 28-31 (October 1960).

4. Blackstone, William T., "Metaethics and Value Conflicts in Education," in the *Proceedings* of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, edited by Martin Levit (Lawrence: University of Kansas, E. E. Bayles, 1963), pp. 9-17.

5. Brameld, Theodore. *Education as Power*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965. See particularly: Ch. 9 - "Values: Education's Most Neglected Problem," pp. 86-102.

6. Brameld, Theodore, and Stanley Elam (eds.). *Values in American Education*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1964. The Report of a Symposium Sponsored Jointly by Phi Delta Kappa International, Alpha Lambda Campus Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa and Boston University.

7. Brightman, Edgar S. *An Introduction to Philosophy*. New York: Henry Holt, 1925.

8. Campbell, Doris. "Difference of Values Among College Students at Different College Levels," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1962) pp. 61-63 in *Abstracts of Doctoral Studies in Education, 1962*. Gainesville, Florida: College of Education, The University of Florida, 1962.

9. Campbell, Roald F., and Russell T. Gregg (eds.). *Administrative Behavior in Education*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

10. Conovan, Rev. Charles, "Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education," *The Eighth Charles W. Hunt Lecture* of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1967).

11. Combs, Arthur (ed.). *Perceiving, Behaving and Becoming: A New Focus for Education*. 1962 Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (National Education Association), 1962.

12. Cuber, John F., and Robert A. Harper. *Problems of American Society: Values in Conflict.* New York: Henry Holt, 1948.

13. Cyphert, Frederick R., "The Value Structures and Critical Thinking Abilities of Secondary School Principals," *Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary-School *Principals* 45: 43-47 (October 1961).

14. Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1916. See particularly: Ch. XVIII - "Educational Values," pp. 271-292.

15. Ehlers, Henry, and Gordon C. Lee (eds.). *Crucial Issues in Education.* (rev. ed.). New York: Henry Holt, 1959. See particularly: "Introduction: Eternal Values in a Changing Era," pp. 137-141.

16. Erickson, Donald, "Do Schools Affect Student Values?" *Administrator's Notebook* 11: 1-4 (December 1962).

17. Florida State Department of Education. *A Guide: Teaching Moral and Spiritual Values in Florida Schools.* Bulletin 14-1962. Tallahassee, Florida: the Department, 1962.

18. Friedman, Bertha B. *Foundations of the Measurement of Values.* Contributions to Education, No. 914. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1946. See Item No. 11 on this bibliography, p. 283, for a concise review of this work.

19. Goldman, Samuel, "The High School Graduate: The High School's Responsibility," *Administrator's Notebook*. 9: 1-4 (April 1961).

20. Gordon, Ira Jay, "A School's Values and Classroom Behavior," *School and Society*. 87: 90-2 (February 28, 1959).

21. Graff, Orin B., Calvin M. Street, Ralph B. Kimbrough, and Archie R. Dykes. *Philosophic Theory and Practice in Educational Administration.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1966.

22. Griffiths, Daniel E. (ed.). *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration.* Part II, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: NSSE, 1964.

23. ______. *Human Relations in School Administration.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

24. Guttchen, Robert S., "Descriptive and Normative as a Functional Distinction," in the *Proceedings* of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, edited by Robert E. Mason (Lawrence: E. E. Bayles, University of Kansas, 1961), pp. 82-83.

25. Hemphill, John K., Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen. *Administrative Performance and Personality: A Study of the Principal in a Simulated Elementary School*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

26. Henry, Jules, "Values: Guilt, Suffering, and Consequences," *School Review* 71: 442-53 (Winter 1963).

27. Hines, Vynce A., "Good Principal, Effective Leader," *Overview* 2: 31-32 (February 1961).

28. Hollins, T. H. B., "The Problem of Values and John Dewey," in *Aims of Education*, edited by T. H. B. Hollins (Manchester, Great Britain: Manchester University Press, 1964), pp. 91-108.

29. Kilpatrick, William Heard (ed.). *Source Book in the Philosophy of Education* (rev. ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1934.

30. Kimbrough, Ralph. *Political Power and Educational Decision-Making*. New York: Rand McNally, 1964.

31. Lipham, James M., "Organizational Character of Education: Administrative Behavior," *Review of Educational Research* 34: 435-50 (October 1964).

32. MacIver, R. M. *Society: Its Structure and Changes*. New York: Ray Long and R. R. Smith, 1931.

33. Morris, Van Cleve, "Values Without Base: The Existential Encounter with Ethical Judgment," in the *Proceedings* of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, edited by Martin Levit (Lawrence: E. E. Bayles, University of Kansas, 1963), pp. 19-27.

34. Newsome, George L., Jr., and Harold W. Gentry, "Logical Consistency, Values, and Authoritarianism in a Sample of Public School Superintendents," *Journal of Teacher Education* 14: 411-16 (December 1963).

35. O'Neill, William F., "Value and the Verification Principle," in the *Proceedings* of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, edited by Martin Levit (Lawrence: E. E. Bayles, University of Kansas, 1963), pp. 99-104.

36. Parker, Dewitt H., "The Analysis of Values," in *Contemporary Philosophy* by James Jarrett and S. M. McMurrin (New York: Henry Holt, 1954).

37. Price, Alfred John, "A Study of the Interactions of Attitudes and Values of Elementary Principals and Their Staffs," unpublished doctoral dissertation. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University, 1961. See *Dissertation Abstracts* 22: 2662-63; No. 8 (1962).

38. Randall, John Herman, Jr., and Justus Buchler. *Philosophy: An Introduction*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1942. See particularly: Ch. XVII - "Ethical and Aesthetic Values," pp. 243-270.

39. Rasmussen, Glen R., "Perceived Value Discrepancies of Teachers and Principals--A Threat to Creative Teaching," *Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals 46: 1-12 (March 1962).

40. Rose, Gale W., "Organizational Behavior and Its Concomitants in Schools," *Administrator's Notebook* 15: n. p.; No. 7 (March 1967). Reprint, 4 pp.

41. Rose, Gale W., "Staff Values, Organizational Behavior and Pupil Response in Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966.

42. Sachs, Benjamin M., "An Investigation of Attitudes Toward Minorities and 'Race' on the Part of Selected Elementary School Administrators," *Educational Administration and Supervision* 42: 29-45; No. 1 (January 1956).

43. ______. *Educational Administration--A Behavioral Approach*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1966.

44. ______. "Leadership: Perception, Values, and Behavior," unpublished article, c. 1967. Typescript, 22 pp. Reproduced in this booklet.

45. ______. "Toward a Social Theory of Leadership Behavior," unpublished monograph. Sacramento, Calif.: the author, 1959.

46. Schipp, Paul (ed.). *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

47. Sears, Jesse B., "Ethics in School Administration," *Educational Forum* 15: 29-37 (November 1950).

48. Smith, Philip G., "A Useful Limit for the Is-Ought Dichotomy," in the *Proceedings* of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, edited by Robert E. Mason and Grace K. Pratt (Lawrence: E. E. Bayles, University of Kansas, 1962), pp. 27-32.

49. ______, "Valuations and the Uses of Language," *Educational Theory* 16: 293-308 (October, 1966).

50. Stanley, William O. *Education and Social Integration*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.

51. Thorndike, Edward L. *Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1912.

52. Turk, Herman, "Social Cohesion Through Variant Values: Evidence from Medical Role Relations," *American Sociological Review*. 28: 28-37 (February 1963).

53. Urban, Wilbur M. *Fundamentals of Ethics*. New York: Henry Holt, 1930.

54. *Values for a Changing America*. Annual Schoolmen's Week *Proceedings, 1964*. University of Pennsylvania, 1966.

55. Willower, D. J., "Values and Educational Administration," *Peabody Journal of Education*. 39: 157-61 (November 1961).

56. Worthen, Richard E., "The Relevance of Values to Psychological Health," an article written especially for this booklet (*Selected Papers on Values*), c. 1968. 10 pp. Typescript.

57. ______, "Values, Psychology, and Existence," unpublished monograph, c. 1965. Typescript reproduced by permission for the members of the Interest Group on Values, NCPEA. 12 pp. Typescript.

# BEAUTY IS IN ALL OF US

The world is a beautiful place and beauty is in all of us.

In the United States, the little boy Walter, and the little girl, Marcia
Dance and sing and cry
For sometimes they are happy,
And sometimes they are sad;
And sometimes they are good,
And sometimes they are ......(you guess!)
But mostly because they just feel like it.

In Africa the little boy, Kimani, and the little girl, Karugi
Dance and sing and cry.
For sometimes they are happy,
And sometimes they are sad;
And sometimes they are good,
And sometimes they are ......(you guess!)
But mostly because they just feel like it.

In China, the little boy Chung Yu, and the little girl, Sun Li
Dance and sing and cry
For sometimes they are happy
And sometimes they are sad;
And sometimes they are good,
And sometimes they are ......(you guess!)
But mostly because they just feel like it.

Everywhere boys and girls
Dance and sing and cry
Walter and Marcia
Kimani and Karugi
Chung Yu and Sun Li
Touch the trees
Smell the flowers
Taste the rocks
Follow the wind.

All over the world boys and girls like to do these things
Because sometimes they are happy,
And sometimes they are sad;
And sometimes they are good,
And sometimes they are ......(you guess!)
But mostly because they just feel like it.

The world is a beautiful place and beauty is in all of us.

--Benjamin M. Sachs

# VALUE PROBLEMS
# OF THE URBAN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR

Charles A. Bird

Professor of Education And Director of Graduate Studies,
Fordham University

The school administrator of 1968 faces not merely conflict on values but overt confrontation with one or more of several groups who not only challenge the administrator's values but also disagree, sometimes violently, with each other on goals and values. The conflict on values is most acute in the urban areas. Even the very definition of "urban areas" will raise questions of values. Many educators have used the term "urban" to describe the "inner city ghetto" while others use the term "urban" to refer to the total metropolis, inner city and suburbs.

For years urban school boards as representatives of the community were considered the agencies to formulate and define values for the schools. Their statements of values, or more frequently their policies to implement the values which they formally adopted or informally accepted, were seldom questioned. The school administrator, usually hired at least partly on the basis that his views did not diverge markedly from the values of the Board or the community, anticipated little conflict with the Board of Education or elements of the community on basic values.

In recent years the value systems of boards of education and administrators have been challenged by representatives of the community, by teacher groups, and by student groups. Demands are made to state legislatures and to state education authorities for the removal of boards of education on the basis that an existing board is not implementing the values of the community. In May 1968 legislation was passed by the New York State Legislature to enlarge the board of education of New York City so as to shift control to a group which would hopefully place a stronger value on the control of education by the local community. In many cities student strikes and boycotts backed by community groups have insisted on policy implementation basic to new or changed values.

Any discussion of change or assessment of values must consider the change of values which has taken place in the relationship of majority-minority cultures. A very distinct change has taken place in the values of the Black Community. The very use of Black rather than Negro is indicative of the change in values. Black Power has come into being because Black citizens have become concerned with the quest for identity, status, and recognition. No longer does the Black citizen desire the values of the white majority. The Black citizen is developing his own values -- values of status, values of accomplishment, values of self-determination. He is developing his own values as to process for accomplishing his goals.

Often the process has been in conflict with the values accepted by the white majority. The Black citizen has developed strong values for the education of the young. He has developed goals which he insists on reaching. He is no longer willing to accept criteria developed by white educators as valid criteria for the judgment of the educational values sought by the Black Community. This shift in values has often led to demands for control of the selection and employment of administraters and teachers, the design of school plant, and the selection and development of curriculum. Open conflict between the organized Black Community and the existing white power structure of local school systems has been a frequent happening because of differences in value systems. The Black community, anxious to develop identity, status, and recognition has placed high value on the placement of Black members in places of educational leadership, the influence of Black teachers in classrooms, and the place of Black history and culture in the school curriculum. The "establishment" developed under middle-class white values has developed process and criteria which make it difficult for the Black Community to influence the values of the school system and, therefore, the Black Community has sought by its own process, the exercise of power, to gain control of school organizations within its boundaries. The Black Community is insisting on participation in decisions about themselves, their future, and the crucial issues of their existence.

Citizens in general, parents and civic-minded members of urban communities are indicating keen interest in the values which school systems are emphasizing or neglecting. Citizens are quick to criticize secondary schools which do not gain college entrance or admission to a trade, mentioning just two points on the spectrum of educational accomplishment. Citizens question the drop-out rate of school systems and evaluate school systems on the basis of student participation in causes or activities which the particular community praises or decries. Juvenile criminal activities or drug addiction too often bring condemnation to the school system which is but one of the social agencies responsible for the unacceptable social behavior. In more and more urban communities members of the community are demanding reports on school accomplishment in reading and fundamental areas of learning. High value is being placed on accomplishment while at the same time demands are made that the school system provide the guidance and therapeutic services necessary to insure the maximum development of each individual pupil. The urban community, both in the inner city ghetto and in the middle or upper class white suburbs, is setting its own values for education and the urban administrator must seriously consider these values if he is to receive the economic and social support necessary to the operation of his school system.

Teachers through their local, state, and national organizations have been gradually forcing a change of values in the organization and administration of urban schools. More and more, not only in matters affecting the economic welfare of teachers, but also in areas of school organization and curriculum, have teachers demanded a part in decision making. In the September 1967 strike of teachers in New York City, the United Federation of Teachers included the organization of "More

Effective Schools" as one of the issues that delayed settlement. In the final agreement money was set aside for curriculum experimentation in ghetto schools. Within individual schools, values and goals of administration have been changed by the participation of teachers in the development of school policy. Throughout the country teachers in urban schools have been influential, collectively and individually, in changing values which had determined organization and curriculum.

Students in urban schools, especially those in middle schools, junior high schools, and senior secondary schools are indicating that they feel they should have a part in the decision making which affects the learning situations and the curriculum. The more overt demands, resulting in boycotts, strikes, and closed schools have been much publicized in the press and communication media of the country. Secondary schools have had lively discussions and dialogues over such problems as drug addiction. Students are demanding that the school provide opportunity for the discussion of controversial issues. Students are questioning the failure of adult society to live up to moral and ethical codes which adults have expounded. As students seek values as guides for learning, the process they pursue often is at variance with the value guidelines of adults, school board members, school administrators, and members of school staff. This confrontation often creates a serious problem for the urban school administrator.

The influence of rebellions taking place in colleges and universities over values and process is directly and indirectly influencing values in urban school systems. Students in urban schools frequently in one way or another attempt to take sides in local college or university disputes. The very existence of college disputes has motivated community members, school staff members, and students to open challenge of some of the values which have been accepted traditionally in the local school.

The school administrator, superintendent or principal, in the urban community of today must be ready to face challenge, to conduct dialogue, and to provide leadership for the maintenance of old or the establishment of new values for urban education. He must be prepared not just to cooperate with majority and minority members of the community, members of the teaching staff, and students but rather to share with them the decision-making process, giving to each the opportunity to participate in decisions.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Charles. *The City Is the Frontier*. New York: Harper, 1965.

Gittell, Marilyn. *Participants and Participation*. New York: Center for Urban Education, 1967.

Hamilton, Charles V. and Carmichael, Stokely. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Random House, 1967.

Havighurst, Robert J. *Education in Metropolitan Areas*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966.

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. *Report*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1968.

N.S.S.E. *Metropolitanism Its Challenge to Education*, 67th Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Reinert, Sue. "A Report on the Student Protests," *The City College Alumnus*, Vol. 63, No. 5, pp. 4-18, March, 1968, New York, N. Y.

Schwartz, Edward. "The Question is Power," *Fordham*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 12-17, March, 1958, Bronx, N. Y., University Relations Division of Fordham University.

# VALUES, PERCEPTION AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

Benjamin M. Sachs

Professor of Education, Sacramento State College,
6000 J Street, Sacramento, California 95819

## I. RATIONALE

Pressing problems in educational administration fall for the most part in the area of social perceptions and attendant values and behaviors that arise from them. However, we have not become aware of these facts. Notice the following:

> Distressingly, too, one must admit Hitler, Mussolini, Castro or Al Capone as successful leaders. In assessing leadership *objectively* one is forced to ignore *morality*, *values*, and *purposes* (italics the writer's).[1]
>
> Leadership is not moral; neither is it immoral. It is amoral. Leaders can be good, or bad. It is the direction and outcome of leadership that counts.[2]

Still morality is essential if the administrator is to perceive himself as a leader in a democratic society, for democracy postulates certain values. The democratic ideals of the importance of the individual and the rights of minorities are value statements and, indeed moral values and behaviors arise from them.[3] Training, therefore, must deal with these matters. Yet in the past we have often dealt with them superficially.

Both the statements above are shallow and may lead to behavior destructive of human dignity. Indeed, they often go counter to what scientists and behavioral scientists actually know about behavior.

Here is a statement from a naturalist on the matter:

> As we know there are animals totally devoid of aggression which keep together for life in firmly united flocks. One would think that such animals would be predestined to develop permanent friendships and brotherly union of individuals and yet these characteristics are never found among such peaceable herd creatures; their association is always entirely anonymous. A personal bond, an individual friendship is found only in animals with highly developed intra-specific aggression; in fact, this bond is the firmer, the more aggressive the particular animal and species is. . .
>
> We know that, in the evolution of vertebrates, the bond of personal love and friendship, was the epoch-making invention created by the constructors when it became necessary for two or more individuals of an aggressive species to live peacefully together and to work for a common end.[4]

Thus, it appears that men who are to lead others and yet do not understand their own aggressions may be, in effect, less able than they believe to relate to other men in a significant way. It is necessary, therefore, not to dismiss negatively valenced emotions nor any part of the personality but to cut deeper into perception if we are to understand what leadership means and administrative behavior suggests.

This fact brings us face-to-face with the need to study the values held by the administrator not only at the conscious level but beneath the level of consciousness.

## II. THE NATURE OF VALUES

Certain things are fairly well established with regard to values. First, we know that values are established early in the history of the individual. Often parental cues form the nature of the value set and the resultant behaviors are almost always adhered to somewhat compulsively without regard to "truth" as one might perceive "truth in contemplation."

> A series of TV programs sponsored by Bell and Howell entitled Close Up investigated the prejudice attitudes of parents in the South. It depicted a scene showing Negro and Caucasian mothers taking their children to a desegregated school while other mothers lined the streets jeering and spitting at them. The cameraman for whatever reason focused on one such spitting mother and then moved the camera down to a baby she was holding on her hip. Was it possible that prejudice was being born here through osmosis?

It might be believed that such prejudiced perception of human beings would not ordinarily exist among sophisticated, educated persons. Here are some statements made by selected elementary school principals in a study during which they were interviewed regarding prejudice.

1. I don't feel there should be any interrelationships between the colored and the white. There's where I draw the line.
2. I think they should be limited there .. (the Negro) ...I think they should have certain neighborhoods set aside for them.
3. The greatest problem...(is)... they want to be white.
4. I don't think that communities and people in general are ready for non-segregation.[5]

The sample consisted of only 14 elementary school principals but it is interesting to note that they split, six severely prejudiced, six chiefly not prejudiced, and two who could not be classified on this value statement. Similar contradictions were found with regard to their beliefs on vocation, money, sex, the place of women and so forth.

One of the most interesting aspects of values is the fact that fundamentally they are irrational. They belong not in the intellectual but the affective domain. The intellect is often used to disguise this phenomenon — a form of defense many psychologists call rationalization. Illustrative of this is the type of humor which is often destructive of the human psyche.[6] The statement, "Aren't all people prejudiced?" without the attendant understanding that prejudice against poverty is of a different order than prejudice against minorities may also illustrate the use of the intellect in rationalizing.

Such an approach may even make research a form of rationalization in denying the nature and direction of the affective domain. It is for this reason that administrative research so often finds itself in a cul-de-sac, and the obvious is seen as depth research when, in effect, it is simply a description of status and successful practice rather than a deep understanding of the problems of leadership and the affective leadership behavior. Note the following which deals primarily with the perception of others and of behavior:

> Educational leaders, as agents of the formal school organizations, are often tempted to react to undesirable organizational behavior on the part of teachers, or try to inhibit it, by becoming more and more directive. They are invited to increase the degree of technically competent leadership by clarifying, redefining, or strengthening the school structure. They set up all kinds of "information," "education," "communication," and "human relations" programs to further this end. These actions, instead of reducing the fundamental cause of conflict and frustration, often augment it and create new causes. However, leadership may continue in its directive ways, hoping that the time will come when the teachers will adapt, and conflict and frustration will disappear.[7]

Even when we think we are dealing with behavior, closer examination makes it clear that what we are describing are traits and practices without the attempt to determine the values related to such behavior. In other words, we overlook the quality of the interaction and the values upon which the interaction rests.

Callahan, in Education and the Cult of Efficiency, points this out.

> . . . America will need to break with its traditional practice, strengthened so much in the age of efficiency, of asking how our schools can be operated most economically and begin asking instead what steps need to be taken to provide an excellent education for our children. We must face the fact that there is no cheap, easy way to educate a human being and that a free society cannot endure without educated men.[8]

Rarely is the dignity of failure, the humanness of error seen as part of the pattern. What would have happened to great leaders like Churchill and Lincoln, great creators like Lawrence and Dostoevsky, if the behavior yardstick used to measure them was the "well-adjusted" man who was successful and efficient? Churchill had many quirks, including not wishing women to vote, not wishing to give the colonies independence and "drinking too much." Lincoln was suicidal and often severely neurotic. But, they were great leaders with democratic values predominant in their behavior. Lawrence had many problems and Dostoevsky was probably an epileptic.

Research, then, becomes a kind of "show and tell," and the result often is "Here's the way I did it," or "This was done and was successful; therefore it is good and right."

At present we believe no one has advanced a behavioral system founded on perception and values. We have postulated a triangle related to power and decision-making which goes like this: "The historical past of the individual is present in his social and psychological perception and is the basis for his values. The interaction of these factors form the behavior of his present power notions and decision-making."[9]

One dimension has been omitted in the above. Allport discusses three basic levels of understanding.

1. Man is seen as a reactive being. Under this rubric I would include outlooks known as naturalism, positivism, behaviorism, operationism, physicalism; these are also sometimes called -- mistakenly, I think -- "scientific psychology."
2. Man seen as a reactive being in depth. Here I include what is variously called psychoanalysis, psychodynamics, depth psychology.
3. Man seen as a being-in-process-of-becoming. This label covers recent trends known as holism, orthopsychology, personalities, existential psychology.[10]

Clearly, then, it is also necessary to take into account the existential notion that it is possible for man to perceive the future as well as to be influenced by the past. Men may not be able to predict the future in terms of specifics, but they can perceive the future in terms of goals and understandings. Such a possibility eliminates for all time the notion that behavior cannot change no matter what the age or condition of the individual although it is true that the more rigid or older the individual the more difficult the prospect. Certainly existential psychology has much significance for the training of educational leaders.

## III. THE QUALITY OF AN ACT

Let us consider another important question which must be discussed before values can be measured with any degree of validity. Bern, in his book, discusses the father-oriented personality, the child-oriented personality and the adult-oriented personality. He describes the reaction of these people as follows: The father-oriented personality seems to function with the following as his cognitive structure--"I am good, you are bad." The child-oriented adult seems to say, "I am bad, you are good." The mature adult, on the other hand, seems to work on the assumption, "I am good, and you are good." He also maintains that there are always these three dimensions but that each individual will emphasize one more than the other.[11]

This raises the question: Is administration basically "father-oriented"? Is it oriented in the direction of "I am good, and you are bad"? Secondary schools, under "well" trained leaders, are run with hall permits, library permits, captive student governments; permits to go to the washroom, failure notices and many more subtle statements that adolescents are bad but teachers are good. School laws often suggest that teachers need to check in and check out of school, must prove they are ill and indeed are "evaluated" on a thinly disguised report card.

Friedenberg, in his book, The Coming of Age in America,[12] suggests the disasterous results of such an approach.

We are in receipt of a little slip originated by an administrator which goes like this:

S O N D J F M A M J ____, 196__ Time ________
______________________ is being sent
from ______________ to: Office___ Principal___
for: Talking___ Conduct___ Clothes___
Swearing___ Impert___ Gum___ No Books___
No Pencil___ Attitude ______________________

Office Action: ____________________________

There is no attempt in this material to set up a hierarchy of values. In this junior high school, we hold that talking, swearing, gumchewing and impertinence all equate. It is possible that the penalties differ, but they are all worthy of the attention of some administrator, the Dean of Girls, the Vice-Principal or the Principal, himself.

No mention is made of far more important values such as self-worth or honesty, and no attempt is suggested, at least in this school, that students might be sent to the administrator because they were creative or argued brilliantly or seem to be on a search for truth.

One is left, then, with a clear inference that the school and the administrator act many times from a shallow interpretation of their function for they do not distinguish acts in terms of the nature of an act. They do not come to grips with the possible identification of the difference between indifference to human worth, sympathy with human worth, and empathy with human worth. In other words, like the famous statement, "A rose is a rose is a rose," "A bad deed is a bad deed is a bad deed." The quality of an act does not seem at all germane. This leads to such unfortunate conclusions as anger has no place in a student's emotional makeup. But anger may be justifiable. One 9th grader, teased for six months by two older and stronger boys and finally having had his homework taken from him, hits one of them after class. The English teacher involved sends him to the Dean for fighting without consideration as to his right to become angry.[13]

Without such understanding there can hardly be a true exchange of realities and genuine influence of behavior. Whether the administrator is functioning with his teachers or the teacher is functioning with his students, each needs to understand the other's reality as well as his own, if any conscious exchange is to occur.

What seems to happen quite often in our legalistic and "efficient" approach to administration is that changes and suggestions are made but the actual interpretation and application of those changes are different from what might have been intended; i.e., the student who is taught reading often develops a distaste for it, faculty committees that are organized and reorganized often behave quite differently from the intent implicit in the organization. Rarely is the material so organized and so presented that the attendant behaviors are dealt with empathically. Yet, no matter how logical the unified school district code is or the attendance laws or the grading system might appear to be, until these take into consideration, somehow, the quality of interaction and the influence it will have upon the values of the persons to whom these matters will apply, the change that will be forthcoming may be more imaginative than real, more atrocious than meaningful.[14]

Since the quality of the act is not established and the values are not involved, we may in effect be able to move from an elected county superintendent to a superintendent elected by a county board as recommended by many documents including "The Future of the Intermediate Unit in California;"[15] but the values and attendant behavior of the administrator to be so appointed is a subject often taken for granted even though we set up apparent qualifications--notions aptly expressed in *Men, Management and Mental Health* by a group of men dealing with industrial management who stated, ". . . we directed our primary attention to people and their individual functioning rather than the organization as an operating system, its efficiency, or its profitability."

Can this be done in a legalistic document? We would submit that all law influences behavior and that recent Supreme Court decisions have pointed the way toward the expansion of humanistic values through law which have now become part of the social conscience of society.

The problem is complicated by the fact that we do not examine the obvious, i.e., that interaction is not a function by itself but is characterized by its quality, for example:

| Quality | Interaction Involving |
|---|---|
| Empathic | Love<br>Hate<br>Service<br>(caring for) |
| Sympathetic | Kindness<br>Courtesy<br>Service<br>(doing good at) |
| Indifference | Narcissism<br>Non-involvement<br>(Pseudo-participation)[17] |

## IV. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF AWARENESS

If we accept some of the notions expressed above, certain changes may obtain. These changes could occur in at least three different dimensions. First, as regards the training program: Perception, values and behavior would become the focal points of a training program for educational leadership rather than state and district organization or school law or housing. The interdisciplinary approach we talk about would deal primarily with awareness. Contacting the humanities does not guarantee an understanding of humanism. The social sciences do not necessarily teach for social values. Nor do the behavioral sciences necessarily encourage the dignity of the individual. Many students of English end up as literary critics rather than as persons more sensitive to the ideals and ideas of the poets and playwrights. Many who emphasize the social sciences can still maintain their attitudes of prejudice toward minorities. Many who work in the behavioral sciences still expect the adolescent and adult, complex though they are, to react as do the well-trained seal on a stimulus-reward basis. Indeed, so primitive is our approach to behaviorism that we are practicing a stimulus--*reward success* or *punishment failure*--response configuration rather than the newer concept advanced by Spindler and others, i.e., stimulus--*reward success* and *ignore error*--response. Many administrators are naive about Gestalt psychology, psychoanalysis and existential psychology. Many administrators do not understand the nature and importance of both the positively and negatively valenced emotions in the emotional life of the individual. Most administrators continue to believe that we live in a highly competitive society when the commitment of a democracy to the worth of each citizen is a highly cooperative ideal.

Second, such training must involve a long apprenticeship not only of courses but of experiences in the various levels of the educational enterprise: elementary and secondary, youth authority and juvenile court, and experiences with all races and all socio-economic levels. A number of institutions are trying to do this but such a program involves more than what the internship is presently considered to be. It may involve as much as ten years' experience in the training of the future administrator. As we see it, however, one of the basic values of unification is the greater opportunity for the unified districts to provide such experiences.[18]

Finally, it becomes important for the professor of education to be encouraged not only to find answers but to theorize about perception and behavior. He should read and study extensively not only in the field of administration but in all fields in which human beings are involved, and to express, in as empathic a fashion as possible, their ideas of the direction of human development.

The Jesuit Teilhard de Chardin was a paleontologist but in his book, The Future of Man,[19] he discusses such things as the new humanism, the collectivization of mankind, faith in peace, and points out that man is evolving toward God because he is a learning creature. Whether one wishes to accept his concept of evolving toward God or not, reading material of this kind gives rise to contemplation that is significant in the development of a professor of educational administration and all future educational leaders. The reading of material from the humanities, the poets, etc., can make a similar contribution. For example, the following from Walt Whitman:

> You whoever you are!
> ....................
> All you continentals of Asia, Africa, Europe, Australia,
> indifferent of place!
> All you on the numberless islands of the archipelagoes of
> the sea!
> And you of centuries hence when you listen to me!
> And you each and everywhere whom I specify not, but include
> just the same!
> Health to you. Good will to you all, from me and America
> sent!

Each of us inevitable!
Each of us limitless--each of us with his or her right upon
the earth!
Each of us allows the eternal purports of the earth!
Each of here as divinely as any is here![20]

Self-examination is implicit in the nature of such an approach and examination could enhance basic goals of education. As we perceive them presently, they are not complex although their implementation may be. Our perception of the goals of education are:

(1) Self worth: The realization by every individual in our schools--students, teachers and administrators--that he has dignity because he exists.
(2) Respect for others: The realization that each person in our schools must recognize the dignity of others because they exist.
(3) The love of learning: The recognition that men are men because of their deep emotional commitments to learning --the process by which men move closer to universal understanding.[21]

## V. A THEORETICAL LOOK AT ADMINISTRATIVE VALUES AND BEHAVIOR

In order to examine behaviors crucial in administration, we have on several occasions attempted to deal with a theory of leadership behavior.[22] We must admit that these were only attempts to understand in some sequence the kinds of behavior in interpersonal relationships which we feel to be the heart of leadership. Present attempts are sporadic, confused and naive. They are, more often than not, contradictory. In Wilson's Educational Administration, we read at one moment such stereotyped items as: "Keeps his mind focused on work to be done instead of watching the clock. . . the good leader will excuse a subordinate for a dental appointment sooner than he would take the privilege himself,"[23] in contrast to a more sophisticated statement mentioned before.

But the attempts have been fraught with an inability to understand empathically the person being served. Directive behavior may be necessary for some and non-directive behavior necessary for others. Therefore, decision-making is predicated more upon the perception of self and others than any other single factor, and interpersonal relations cannot have any significant meaning unless the administrator is aware of himself and the persons he is serving. In addition, he must be able to help others establish greater self-identification and self-worth. But these ideas are predicated on the values that one has incorporated into his dynamics.

Clearly one cannot succeed with all persons with whom he is in contact. But the attempt is of great significance to all concerned. A teachers working with one youngster while the others are doing written work is not neglecting the others. He is teaching how important each individual is to him whether he "succeeds" or "fails," whether he is "good" or "bad."

It will become clear as one reads this theoretical attempt, that each man "plays many parts"--that one may assume one role at one time and another in some other situation. But the first step to awareness and self-evaluation is to bring to the conscious level how we might be behaving and under what value structure we are operating.

The fact remains that we have done very little about administrative values and behavior as such. The following then is an attempt on our part to deal with these areas in some theoretical frame.

(1) The Absorption of Power (The Other-Exploitive Personality). It has been pointed out in the Authoritarian Personality[24] that many persons who come from stern, authoritarian father-dominated families tend to be authoritarian themselves unless they have carried on some "principled" revolt against this situation. These are persons whom I have called "other-exploitive." They have a tendency to absorb from others their dignity and power even though one might see them as "giving" persons. This giving, however, has a paternalistic flavor and is more in the nature of favor-giving than the giving of self.

Here are some methods of exercise of power which seem to be characteristic of such persons.

a. Classification and Status: Where an individual has a title or rank, he is entitled to the degree of "respect" related to this class or status. Differences in values or the degree of insight have little or nothing to do with this assigned status.

b. Power and Strength: Such an individual sees within the group the members who have power to "get things done," are "able to make decisions." The level of decision-making or the attendant complexities have nothing to do with the matter. Often, the more obvious the decision, the better. Docket and desk are clean; work is "effectively done." These are often essential criteria by which this individual measures his effectiveness.

c. Control and Authority: Since a loss of authority is related to a loss of identity, such people need to see themselves as all-knowing and any person over whom they have authority must prove himself to them. This form of control means that delegation of authority is often superficial and any and all interaction which begins to assume a greater or less amount of self-determination must be pulled back "into line." This process creates a feeling of self-protection for the "other-exploitive" personality.

d. *Lack of Involvement:* There is, of course, underlying the above a fear of involvement and thus "democratic" interaction, while it may obtain in terms of the accouterments of the process, does not really resolve into democratic decision-making since the administrator must, for the most part, either control decisions or not have them happen. In effect, Robert's *Rules of Order* has greater significance for this individual in terms of interaction than the more difficult but more insightful "talking things through" until some integration of ideas has been reached.

Since such a process may be "messy," this is repugnant to the other-exploitive individual. Controls need to be neat; thus, the very heart of the democratic function, the tolerance of ambiguity, is discouraged.

e. *The Role of the Majority:* Such an individual seems to be subject to majority pressure--that is to say, that finding himself in a position with the minority would leave him somewhat traumatized by the fact that he would not have the kind of support he needs and which he had needed throughout his developmental period. When mother and father both agree that the infant has performed well and smile upon him, he has achieved success in this kind of family structure. But even one dissenting vote may leave him unhappy and uneasy. So that when there is a split within a group and the vote is four to one, the individual will seize the four as having more power (affection) to offer him, and therefore he will accept it. His defense is based on the fallacious notion that since "majority rules," it is the heart of the democratic process.

f. *The Need for Security:* Such an administrator also tends to seek security on this premise from well-established in-groups. Those are themselves powerful groups who have status within the society and their dissent is not the dissent of struggle but rather the dissent of a difference of opinion, as between one power group and another.

g. *The Aggressive-Submissive Phenomenon:* It follows also that such an individual, impressed as he is by status and authority, will tend to "obey" his superiors regardless of their insights and understandings. Conversely, he will find it extremely difficult to be influenced by his subordinates, no matter what their contributions to him might be. Rank, rather than people, have meaning for him; and he salutes the "uniform," not the "man."

(2) The Denial of Power and Decision-Making (The Self-Exploitive Personality).

Behavior of this kind is often predicated on the notion that power is corrupting and the self is all-important in human relationships. Despite the egocentricity of such an approach, one should not overlook the fact that this egocentricity is quite different from the one described above. In contrast to the essential lack of involvement characterized by those who absorb the power of others, these persons have a tendency to exploit and give almost too much of themselves. In a prodigious manner, the great artists drain from themselves to give to others. This might also be said of certain types of leadership. It has been said that Lincoln suffered more during the Civil War than did any other person. Actually, at certain points in his life, he was suicidal; and, if we examine history, we may find that some very creative leaders fall into this category.

Behavioral characteristics that we might encounter in this kind of person are the following:

a. A Purported Weakness: Since this person tends to exploit himself rather than others, he may be seen as "weak" and vacillating because he needs considerable reassurance about personal identification. However, in doing this he reaches out to others and here lies his great strength for no matter how insecure the individual seems to be, he is reassuring to all except the authoritarian in that he makes it very clear that persons are of great significance to him.

b. The Suspicion of Power: Having some question about power and the nature of power itself, these individuals are challenging of all authority. They always tend to question their immediate superiors and those superiors, if they are absorbing power, may see this type of questioning as "disloyal" or as not responding to a person interested in their welfare even though this interest is paternalistic and dehabilitating. But such behavior is not disloyal; it is, rather, demanding reassurance from the authority figure. In reality, it seems to be their purpose to challenge authority with the idea that through the insight of the authority figure, they, themselves, can arrive at greater understanding.

c. Support of Minority: These persons have a tendency, it seems, to support the underdog and the minority. This area of performance is of extreme significance in the democratic hierarchy of values for this person tends to perceive that the protection of the minority justifies an attack upon authority.

The fact, however, that the individual supports positions that may not be respectable in the narrow sense of the word, does not mean that he, himself, is eager to destroy the point of view of the majority. What he does stand for is the right of the minority to express and work for their views and ideals--a stand which is buttressed by his own emotional needs. Clearly such an administrator while having more problems than the former, would tend to be much more supportive of the fundamental tenets of democratic action.[25] Yet at present, in our notions of decision-making, the very nature of his travail is seen as a handicap to his administrative function.

History, however, may show that such so-called weak and vacillating leaders make great contributions, however unconsciously, to the democratic development of society provided the society itself is not authoritarian and exploitive of others. It is implicit in the notion of tentativeness and ambiguity that the individual must ask for counsel from others and it is not mere happenstance that many such leaders have surrounded themselves with subordinates whose views challenge their own.

d. The Creative Nature of Denial: Being in search of self, such persons are prone to become much more sensitive to others and the world about them. They have very thin defenses and their field of perception is broad. Cues from others have a tendency to hit them and to penetrate their defenses.[26] It follows, therefore, that their ability to give to others becomes the richer as their opportunity for interaction is increased. Far from denying such persons opportunity to perform in administrative roles, it would seem that these persons need greater opportunity. As they can perceive human conditions more clearly, they become better able to enhance the dignity of all concerned.

(3) The Avoidance of Power (The Self-Supportive Personality). Some administrators as well as teachers, having become aware of the conflictual nature of the assumption of leadership and that in a democracy leadership is expendable, seek to avoid power. Theirs is a passive acceptance of their task and they join such groups and do such things as need doing. Some characteristics of their behavior follow:

a. The Denial of Conflict: These people seem to be content to remain where they are and to do the best job possible under the circumstances. Their involvement is not shallow, but they do not wish to become so involved that they will lose themselves in the conflict attendant to decision-making. In this sense, there is a flight from the democratic nature of responsibility in that democracy is predicated upon argumentation and dissent.

b. The Importance of Individuals: Such people genuinely feel the importance of others, but they do not wish to lose their precarious state of homeostasis. It rarely occurs to them that upset is an important facet of life and learning with the return to balance a form of problem-solving. As a result, their schools and districts are often calm and non-tumultous places until such time as some demanding group seeks to upset the balance.

c. The Apparent Desirability of Balance: Since all of us seek peace in this way, these administrators may be seen as ideal. In some ways, as are any of the others, they are. They strive and succeed admirably in establishing an apparent climate of content which for all intents and purposes seems to serve all. Yet, the truth is that such behavior carries with it a lack of responsibility to life itself which by hypothesis carries the seeds of conflict within it.

d. The Mature Nature of Balance: It must be acknowledged that such people are usually quite mature in their judgment and are able to preserve the dignity of many, if not most, of the persons with whom they are involved. It is for this reason that they are often much respected and usually seem to make good administrators.

e. The Loss of Creativity: One element, however, seems to be missing and that is the lack of the development of creativity. Creativity involves conflict and ambiguity. As unfortunate as it may be, it is difficult if not impossible to find a creative personality who has not had conflictual areas in his life. One needs only to look at the lives of writers and artists to see this. Even when kept quiet, never appearing on the surface, deeper study shows that such conflict did in fact obtain. Indeed, such a person is tilting at windmills; for, although he seeks to avoid such interaction and seems to achieve this, the truth is that the learning situation becomes routine and the work of all concerned, while acceptable, is hardly startling. It is interesting to note that much education including higher education tends to encourage such behavior.

f. Social Responsibility: Although creativity is somewhat reduced, they are willing for all with whom they come in contact to obtain the kind of satisfaction and peace that is inherent in their own dynamic needs. Thus they do not exploit others for they do not wish to exploit themselves.

(4) The Release of Power (The Other-Supportive Personality). Perhaps the most mature form of behavior is that of a person who recognizes and accepts the temporary condition of himself and his leadership. Such acceptance is, of course, extremely difficult for it brings to the conscious level the very nature of life itself. It suggests, as has been said elsewhere, that the moment one is born, one begins to die. But it is implicit in the role of leadership that to perceive this is to perceive more readily each man in his own right and to perceive more readily the universality of every man as well as his uniqueness. Some behavioral characteristics of this person seem to be:

a. Acceptance of the Temporary Nature of Leadership: The leader in a democratic society might well be measured in light of how much more successful the members of his group become in their own leadership development than by measuring the successful leader in terms of his ability to "get things done," "to make decisions" and "hold his job." As a matter of fact, the role of this person in a sense foreshadows his own elimination for he is more interested in the development of others than he is in maintaining his own position of authority. So he makes a greater commitment to the members of his group than he does to himself. But this commitment is not made necessarily in terms of longer working hours and other superficial matters. It becomes apparent to most, if not all of the persons he serves that their dignity and worth are of great significance to him as a personal value.

b. The Importance of Commitment: It is important that we recognize the empathic nature of such a commitment and that we become more aware of the fact that an individual able to develop more successful leaders than himself is of inestimable value to a democratic society. He becomes truly a professor of educational administration and the fact that someone might take his place does not concern him nearly as much as it does the person whose basic role is to drain power from others. It must be admitted that no man truly enjoys the prospects of someone younger and more virile than he usurping his role. But it also should be noted that these men function as the ideal father, fully aware that their sons must displace them, however distasteful the prospect. Their fundamental commitment, then, is to the evolutionary process of men and in this they suggest not only sociological and psychological factors but practice the very heart of democracy itself which, unless we are wrong, is constantly examining and re-examining itself in order to make it more enlightened for the citizens who reside in it.

c. The Social Conscience: The above gives rise to the phenomenon of the social conscience. Much of education is concerned with turning in homework, answering correctly, being on time, etc. Administratively there is much concern about hall passes, program changes, XYZ grouping and the grading system, among many, many other so-called ideals. But most of these are related to a primitive kind of conscience which states in effect--do the right thing and you will be rewarded; do the wrong thing and you will be punished.

The social conscience is of a much higher order. It involves the goals mentioned above: Self-worth, a respect for others and a love of learning. The commitment to the social conscience seems easy enough, and yet it is much more difficult to establish than we presently believe. Loving one's neighbor is an aspect of the social conscience. Yet how poorly we succeed in this. The administrator with a social conscience is not just concerned about his faculty and their errors. He is more likely to be appreciative of the resources they have and their strengths. Lest we perceive this as an easy undertaking, let us face the fact that most teaching, far from being creative, is as conforming and confining for the teacher as the curriculum is for the student.

d. Learning as a Dynamic Process: The administrator whose basic commitment is to release power to others (and notice this does not necessarily mean delegation of authority) is more concerned with the excitement of learning and the commitment of teachers to students than he is about rules and regulations and handbooks. But all over the country, many administrators are spending their time and their concern about what kinds of hair a male student shall wear, how long skirts should be and whether shirt tails are tucked in. A social conscience would not be concerned with the right and wrong of these situations but rather with their appropriateness. All behavior, then, could be related to time, place and circumstances. Unless the administrator becomes more aware of this, what he does as a teacher of teachers is to suggest the absolute nature of behavior rather than the fact that behavior is almost always relative to the environment.

e. The Ability to Accept Ambiguities: The great strain placed upon administrators who seek to solve the problem of education in such a way as to reduce ambiguities makes the process filled with unnecessary anxiety. Man may be defined in terms of error as readily as he is defined in terms of correctness. Indeed, without error much of science would never have come about at all. The most intimate of relationships, marriage, is filled with ambiguity and error. The administrator whose basic premise is to release power to others cannot only accept the dignity of others but can accept the ambiguities implicit in life itself. Thus, he does not let the vociferous authoritarian dominate the faculty, but he also does not destroy him. It is as though he said, "If you need rules and regulations, you may have them. Others do not. So they do not need rules and regulations." To live with this kind of ambiguity is not easy for we have been conditioned to recognize the idea that there is a right and wrong answer and not that the struggle of men for understanding is the struggle toward empathy, rather than establishing sympathy for or aloofness from the human condition.

Perhaps it is for this reason that such an administrator can see that in the Negro ghetto poetry and music flourish while in the middle-class ghetto, man seems more concerned with having the right job and two cars.

f. *The Recognition of Man's Universality:* This kind of administrator feels or knows that men seek universally much of the same things. Indeed, he recognizes that men are more alike than different. In all societies, no matter how primitive, men seek among other things, the meaning and purpose of life, an expression of beauty, a need for having dignity in one's own family and society. He perceives clearly, whether he works in the middle-class ghetto or the Negro ghetto, that the woman who kinks her hair is basically no different from the woman who de-kinks her hair for both are in a quest for beauty. He recognizes that poetry, the dance and music belong to all. That it is difficult to see the difference between "Sometimes I feel like a motherless child, a long way from home," and "This is the way the world ends--not with a bang but with a whimper."

This means that his fundamental purpose, as an administrator, is to organize his curriculum and his faculty and his grouping so as to suggest these things and to make them much clearer than they are at present.

g. *The Appreciation of Differences:* Such an administrator does not worship at the shrine of the isolation of differences, i.e., XYZ grouping. He perceives differences in quite a different way. Fundamentally, he suggests that differences can create unity. Since the universal needs of man are more significant than his differences, the differences become ways of exchanging knowledge, of encouraging each to make a contribution to another, and of helping all to perceive the importance of each to one another.

In a book called *The Uneducated*[27], the author asked "Where would teachers *be but for the* fact that students lack an education?" and pointed out that ". . . in the major cause of continuing illiteracy, attention must be directed not to a lack of opportunity for schooling but to a lack of adequate schooling." We would ask "Where would the gifted be if they could not serve the less-gifted? Where would the wise be if they could not express their wisdom for the less wise to contemplate?" It is these factors that destroy XYZ groupings and bring to the fore the fact that men need one another, bright and slow, faculty and students, administrator and faculty.

h. The Support of a Minority: It has been noted by many writers in many disciplines that the minority position is more often than not the prelude to progress. By minority we do not mean the powerful minority who in truth is a majority. Charisma has an effect of being more powerful, and, in operation, functions as a majority more than we presently realize. A Pope can exercise great charismatic power. What we are suggesting is that such an administrator can empathize with the minority who hold unpopular views, who cause us to extend our thinking, who make us feel a little less important and who, above all, encourage the evolutionary nature of man toward greater insights and understandings.

Mary Parker Follette [28] years ago suggested that compromise was not necessarily an answer to problems nor was the ascendancy of one group over another. Rather it was possible, frequently, to integrate two points of view into a unity which could have meaning for all concerned. We suggest that the administrator who can release power to others is particularly adept at this kind of practice. But we know that such practice--while discussed at the present time--is rarely, if ever, taught. The administrator, as a product of the school system, is never given the opportunity either in his formative or teaching years to learn how to perceive the kernel of truth that may appear in two diametrically opposed ideas. Yet, in many ways, this is the heart of democracy. Men seek their self-worth through interaction with others but unconsciously we usually classify them as right or wrong when, in effect, they may be, as are all men, both right and wrong. The problem of the administrator is to seek out what might appear to be right and to enhance it, to understand what might appear to be wrong but not to eliminate it since he understands that error is the human condition and is often only temporary. In this way he can perceive the dignity of failure. Such is the nature of integrated thinking.

The above is a construct which we have suggested. We neither propose it as the construct to be followed slavishly nor as the construct to be dismissed because it has very little to do with administration as we presently define it. What we are suggesting is that we need to come to grips with the perceptions of the individual, the values he accepts, whether consciously or not, and the behaviors attendant to those perceptions and values.

## NOTES

1. For an early discussion of the amoral nature of leadership see Fayol, Henri, "Administration, Industrielle et Generale," trans. Paris: Dunod, Editeur. 1920, p. 11; in Wilson Robert E., Educational Administration, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, 1966, p. 5.

2. It is interesting to note that 43 years later the same concept still exerts appeal. Stoops, Emery, "Keys to Leadership," Phi Delta Kappan, XLV, (October 1963) in Wilson, Robert E., Educational Administration, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, 1966, p. 52.

3. For a more complete discussion of democratic premises and attendant behaviors see Sachs, Benjamin M., Educational Administration--A Behavioral Approach, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, pp. 3-90.

4. Lorenz, Konrad, On Aggression, Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., New York, 1963, p. 216 and p. 299.

5. Ten years later the same issues exist. See Sachs, Benjamin M., "An Investigation of Attitudes Toward Minorities and Race on the Part of Selected Elementary School Administrators," Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 42, No. 1, January 1956, pp. 38-39.

6. Even though humor is regarded by many philosophers as possessing a high intellectual component, it does not follow that it is necessarily enhancing of the persons involved. For further discussion of humor see Sachs, Benjamin M., Educational Administration--A Behavioral Approach, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, pp. 42-43.

7. Bartky, John A., "The Depressive State of Educational Leadership," The Clearing House, November 1963, pp. 131-135, in Wilson, Robert E., Educational Administration, Merrill Books, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, 1966, p. 56. Note the contradictions in Wilson's readings on administration. Also, is it possible for "frustrations to disappear" in life?

8. Callahan, Raymond E., Education and the Cult of Efficiency, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962, p. 264.

9. Sachs, Benjamin M., Educational Administration--A Behavioral Approach, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, pp. 62-63.

10. Allport, Gordon W., "Psychological Models for Guidance," Guidance and Examination, edited by Ralph L. Mosher, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York, 1965, p. 13.

11. Berne, Eric, M. D., *Transactional Analysis in Psychotherapy*, Grove Press, Inc., New York, 1961, Chapters 6 and 7, pp. 60-80.

12. Friedenberg, Edgar Z., *Coming of Age in America*, Random House, New York, 1965. The entire volume is devoted to examining the behavioral premises upon which the modern secondary school rests.

13. "The Case of Don" in Sachs, Benjamin M., *The Student, The Interview, and The Curriculum--Dynamics of Counseling in the School*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, pp. 133-171.

14. Sarason, Seymour B., "The School Culture and Processes of Change," *The Brechbill Lecture, University of Maryland*, Yale University, January 10, 1966.

15. Committee of Ten, "The Future of the Intermediate Unit in California," sponsored by the California Association of County Superintendents of Schools and County Boards of Education Section of the California School Boards Association, September, 1966.

16. Levinson, Harry, Charlton R. Price, Kenneth J. Munden, Harold J. Mandl and Charles M. Solley, *Men, Management and Mental Health*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1962, p. IX.

17. Sachs, Benjamin M., "The Quality of An Act," *Educational Administration--A Behavioral Approach*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, Chapter 10, pp. 142-153. Also, Chapter 12 "The Development of Empathy", pp. 168-181.

18. Sachs, Benjamin M., "The Behavioral Sciences as 'Tools' in Role Perception," *Educational Administration--A Behavioral Approach*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, Chapter 8, pp. 109-127. A discussion on the use of the district in such a training program will be found in Chapter 17, "The Improvement of the Preparation Program: Some Aspects of Training," pp. 261-264.

19. de Chardin, Pierre Teilhard, trans. by Norman Denny, *The Future of Man*, Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1964.

20. Whitman, Walt, "Salute au Monde," *Leaves of Grass*, Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1940, New York.

21. Sachs, Benjamin M., "The Goals of Education," *Educational Administration--A Behavioral Approach*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, Chapter 13, pp. 182-200.

22. Sachs, Benjamin M., "Toward a Social Theory of Leadership Behavior," unpublished monograph, copyright 1959.

23. Wilson, Robert E., *Educational Administration*, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, 1966, p. 51. Note the contrast with that listed under 7.

24. Adorno, T. E., and others, *The Authoritarian Personality*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, p. 387. Although sixteen years old, this book needs examination by all educational leaders.

25. For further discussion see Sachs, Benjamin M., "The Meanings of Groups," *Educational Administration--A Behavioral Approach*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, Chapter 3, pp. 33-43.

26. *Ibid.* "Aspects of the Creative Act," Chapter 11, pp. 154-167.

27. Ginzberg, Eli, *The Uneducated*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1953, p. 232. It is interesting to note that Ginzberg *et al* have recently published a book entitled *Democratic Values and the Rights of Management*, Columbia University Press, 1963, in which they discuss the conflict between the values attendant to personal dignity and management.

28. Follett, Mary Parker, *Dynamic Administration*, edited by Metcalf, Henry C. and Urwick, L., Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York, pp. 160-166. Despite the significance of this work, not much attention seems to have been accorded it as is the case of Newlon's work, *Educational Administration As Social Policy* written in the 1930's.

# SOME IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL CHANGE FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR

Edward T. Ladd

Director of Teacher Education, Emory University

(Paper delivered to the Southern Regional Council
on Educational Administration, November 16, 1965)

When I studied school administration about 25 years ago, I learned that the superintendent of schools was the executive officer who is responsible for the carrying out of policies laid down by a lay school board. The principal in turn was apparently supposed to carry out these policies in detail, that is, within a narrower range. It is oversimplifying the notion, but not too greatly, to picture it as a funelling-down concept.

In recent years I've seen a good deal of superintendents in action, and verbalism and theory have been illuminated by facts. May I say parenthetically that I have come to have the highest respect for the job of the school superintendent and for some of those occupying the position and a strong impression that as a people we neither take the superintendency seriously enough nor treat superintendents with even the beginnings of fairness. My impression is that most superintendents believe the principle I learned 25 years ago and that each in his own way, however ill-defined, tries to play the role it suggests. Thus, within the limits set by their school boards, superintendents hire employees, transmit to them their own interpretations of what general policies mean in practice, change interpretations as they see fit, spend money, get buildings built, and so on.

Within narrower limits the principal, playing the part of a sort of vestpocket superintendent, does the same. Within these limits he likewise acts as he sees fit, trying to keep teachers busy and reasonably effective and happy, assuaging the ire of irate parents, seeing that classrooms are kept neat, with no paper on the floor, and keeping children from running in the hall.

Thus the administrator's role is somewhere in the middle of an organization in which wisdom is funneled down into narrower and narrower containers--or at least decision-making is, whether wise or not.

There are important variations in the way school systems are administered, but curiously enough these don't seem to affect the principle. Some school boards delegate their prerogatives to administrators in very sweeping fashion, tending to abdicate or acquiesce. Others, it is said, run their school systems themselves. But the funneling principle holds, and, because they are at the narrow end, teachers may not even know how much delegation there is except through the gossip they pick up on the side. Some school superintendents are capricious, seeming to have no policies or principles, some are strongly dedicated to smooth-running efficiency, and apparently a very tiny number are dedicated to innovation (Roald F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools, Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965, p. 212). Whichever group he falls in, the superintendent is likely to play the dominant carrier-out-of-policies role. And he probably plays the role whether or not he is the type who consults with or listens to those below him in the hierarchy.

There has, of course, been the mythology of "democratic school administration." But by any precise definitions of democracy and of administration such a concept would seem to be an impossibility, as the practice indeed is. Of course, those who have used the term really have meant simply a manner of administration which involves subordinates in policy-making and treats them justly and kindly. A very humane superintendent of the author's acquaintance once illustrated the dilemma dramatically. He said in a planning meeting, "Of course, in our school system we draw up tables of organization, but then"--gesturing with his thumb--"we erase all the lines and just all work together to get the job done." Humane and sensible, yes. But what if there is disagreement? "Then those who disagree just come to me, and I decide which way it's going to be done." Democratic? No, administration can't be democratic: there is always an overt or covert table of organization.

We shall not here go into the historical reasons why the funneling-down principle should remain dominant in school administration some time after it was abandoned by the theorists of administration and by many, perhaps most, of the practioners of administration in other large organizations. The latter groups concluded some time ago that large organizations, if they are to function effectively, must be bureaucratized. Some years ago Carl Friedrich of Harvard put down the six requirements that must be met--and that were in fact met--in all large bureaucracies he had studied: Members of the organization are hold together in a more or less centralized organization, their functions are differentiated, and they are required to have explicit qualifications for their offices. They behave with objectivity, with precision and consistency, and with discretion. (Friedrich, Carl J., Constitutional Government and Democracy, 1950, p. 44)

To be sure, school systems are centralized, and in many of them there are explicit qualifications for office--through these are more often imposed by state authorities than by the systems themselves. On the other indices, when compared with other large organizations, school systems are fairly low. In regard to them the typical school system is, in fact, quite unlike other large civilian organizations, governmental or private, and strikingly unlike its sister professional organization, the hospital.

## I. SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION: UNCONSTRAINED ADMINISTRATION

The closest analogy may be the 18th-century despotism, which, you will remember, was, as often as not, benevolent, though it sometimes was tyrannical. To reduce the likelihood that you will misunderstand or misquote me, let me try to explain precisely what I mean by the analogy. I use the term "despotism" not as a term of abuse but as a technical term. The characteristics of the despotisms was that the monarch's powers and duties in relation to all the people he had dealings with were not precisely limited or defined in writing. The reason I draw the analogy is that, within the limits set by outside forces, in the internal operations of school systems administrators have a relatively high degree of freedom, their roles not being laid down in black and white. Within the limits just mentioned they have something of the position of princes, unconstrained by the paraphernalia of bureaucracy. May I suggest that, in order to have a term for administration in which the explicit division of labor is not highly refined, we call such administration "unconstrained." In unconstrained administration there are relatively few persistent formal routines; there are few written internal agreements, policies, or directives; precedents are not carefully noted and husbanded; and, there are no elaborated procedures for communication from each part of the organization to the others.

Permit me to report some specific observations which suggest how little our school systems are bureaucratized, and how unconstrained their administrators are.

1. Many school systems have no written operating procedures dealing with the main areas of concern, curriculum and instruction.

2. Many have no written contracts with their teachers.

3. Few school systems have regularly scheduled times for oral communication between principals and superintendents, and few schools have such arrangements for communication between

principals and teachers, between teachers and other teachers, or between teachers and other staff members.

4. Many school systems have no procedures for regular written dissemination of information to the staff. Apart from daily attendance sheets circulated in many high schools, most schools have no information bulletins.

5. Few school systems have formal training procedures of any scope.

6. Few have formal personnel evaluation procedures.

7. Few school systems have formal grievance procedures.

8. Many school administrators keep an "open door" policy, and receive and deal single-handedly with all comers.

9. There are many jobs in school systems for which explicit or even implicit job descriptions seem hardly to exist; these include several kinds of assistant superintendencies, the position of area superintendents in a large city system, supervisor, and vice-principal and department chairman in a high school. (Incidentally, it may be significant that most institutions training school administrators seem to have found it unnecessary to make clear-cut distinctions between programs for beginning principals and programs for beginning superintendents.)

10. The typical superintendent, so the evidence suggests, spends little time on ". . . delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group, and . . . endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure." (Andrew W. Halpin, as quoted by Campbell et al, 1965, p. 212).

## II. SOME CONSEQUENCES THAT FLOW FROM UNCONSTRAINED SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

School administration unconstrained by bureaucratic paraphernalia and red tape has the one great virtue of being able to make rapid and radical progress. It was under this kind of school administration that our great city systems were built in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries--as was indeed true of our great industrial concerns as well. It is fairly well agreed among students of the subject that leadership and administration are not the same thing, the leader being concerned with innovation and the administrator with maintaining and keeping tidy. If we were living in an age when we were willing to risk our well-organized school systems for the chance of interesting innovation here and there, unconstrained administration might make sense, as it did in the past.

Another virtue of unconstrained administration, if indeed it is one, is that it allows us to keep our schools running with relatively few administrators. A single administrator in a school comprising a thousand people is not a rarity. Similarly, if you put the decision-making for the whole system largely into the hands of a superintendent, he can keep quite a number of schools going with the aid of only a tiny office staff.

Few of us would doubt the deleterious nature of a third consequence: the general weakness of teachers as a force in American public education. At almost every meeting I attend I hear the comment that teachers are in fact treated not like professionals but like hirelings. The sway of administrators has tended to keep teachers weak--though probably few administrators have consciously desired such an end. Most conspicuously they have kept teachers from getting together in formal or informal organizations of their own within the system or state or nationwide. While administrators do encourage membership in so-called "teachers' organizations" and attendance at their meetings, these are organizations in which for the most part the administrators themselves have veto power, direct or indirect. And while administrators will get school boards to pay substitute teachers for a day or more, so that regular faculty members can travel to state or national meetings, I've never heard of teachers being excused so that they could attend local teacher-initiated meetings during work hours. (In this respect teachers are treated differently from persons in most other professions, though, because of their isolation from one another during the work-day, they need such contacts more than do most others.)

A fourth consequence of unconstrained administration is a low incidence of negative information and challenge to the administrator's ideas moving up from those subordinate to him. While the incidence may be low in highly organized bureaucracies as well, the routines of bureaucracy mentioned above are a necessary, if not a sufficient, condition of an abudnant flow upward of relatively uncensored information and ideas.

A fifth, most important consequence of unconstrained administration is that impossible levels of wisdom and virtue are demanded and expected of the school administrator. In most other bureaucracies the chief executive officer is not allowed to impose his personal view until he has in some measure persuaded a heterogeneous professional staff to accept it. (Richard Neustadt has documented in detail the way this holds for the President of the United States.) But in return for the unconstrained power they are given, school administrators are expected to be free from errors. And when things seem to go smoothly it may even happen that people believe they are free from errors. Of the superintendent, Campbell and his associates write this:

> School staffs, boards of education, and even superintendents themselves have tended to define the superintendent as a superman. He is supposed to be a paragon of personal virtue, a man of culture and charm, a professional who knows teaching and learning, an efficient manager of people and things, and finally an educational statesman of great wisdom and charisma. (Campbell *et al.*, p. 225.)

This high image and self-definition are enhanced if, as time goes by, the administrator is infrequently challenged by his fellow professionals within the system.

These high expectations have effects of several kinds.

First, they increase the superintendent's vulnerability. Callahan has already demonstrated the superintendent's vulnerability from the budgetary point of view. (Raymond E. Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962). But to define anyone as perfect makes him vulnerable from every point of view. Recently in Georgia two superintendents were publicly criticized on separate issues where censorship was being advocated, in one case of a novel on the library shelves, in another of a film being shown on the educational TV station. These two superintendents were vulnerable and were obviously aware of it. It is interesting that one of them finally rescued himself by referring to constraints which had been introduced and in the meantime forgotten--a set of guidelines on controversial issues, and that the other rescued himself by appointing a committee to draw up such guidelines. In effect each was denying that he had as much wisdom as those who had studied the issues.

Second, the high expectations placed on him encourage many an administrator to attach a disproportionate importance to himself and his own beliefs and views. The administrator who has an exaggerated sense of his own importance may overlook or misunderstand administrative or policy problems which with more modesty he might have educated himself about. (One thinks of many able superintendents' misreading of the race problem.)

Third, in so far as an administrator sees himself, his beliefs, and his views as infallible, he is likely to view professional relationships or normal professional controversy or political heat in personal terms, particularly in terms of loyalty. It comes naturally to all of us who are administrators, but school administrators seem to be particularly given to seeing their professional relationships in personal terms. One often hears a principal or superintendent speak of "teachers who work for me."

Some time ago the then Illinois State Superintendent of Schools distributed two little placards. One read: "The Boss--he may not always be right, but he's always the boss." The other (paraphrased) read "Whenever you work for [sic] a man, be unswervingly loyal to him [sic] ." The interesting thing is that many local school administrators so completely concurred with the views represented in the mottoes that they posted the placards prominently.

Recently an assistant superintendent of my acquaintance, attending a meeting of a citizens' study panel, heard one member remark, "If we have to, let's put pressure on Superintendent Richardson." The direction of the pressure envisaged would have furthered that particular superintendent's own objectives and might have been expected to be welcome. But his assistant later expressed disappointment that the meeting had "indulged in personalities."

It is natural, furthermore, for an overly self-confident administrator to drift into arbitrariness in his dealings with subordinates: he may come to concern himself with teachers' or applicants' personal affairs, their religions affiliations or political views, he may undertake to make decisions about the censoring of books, or he may be guided by his own religious preferences in matters which are really questions of church and state. All of these phenomena have been especially common in the South, where the homogeneous Anglo-Saxon, Protestant middle-class character shared by the dominant groups in the communities and the school administrators has tended to give us school systems which are not only principalities but theocratic ones. A high school principal of my acquaintance was horrified at the suggestion that he was not entitled to combat juvenile delinquency by scheduling a Youth for Christ rally in his school. After the first Supreme Court ruling on prayer in the schools and before any staff discussion, an excellent assistant superintendent in a fine school system said in a television interview that the system would ignore the ruling.

Finally, the more an administrator has yielded to the tendency to see himself as the chief source of wisdom, the harder he will find it to get outside organizations to cooperate with him on any real give-and-take basis. Surely this is one of the blocks to intermediate-unit organization. It is an obvious block to the collaborative school-university relationships which many superintendents and college people are working hard to create. Recently an able and well-meaning assistant superintendent approached several institutions of higher learning, asking for their agreement to cooperate on a specific Title III proposal. The universities had not previously been consulted about their possible role in the project. Letters of intent to cooperate were needed within six days. No written materials about the plan were available or would be for some time. The school administrator had no idea of the amount of necessary bureaucratic detail that would have to be worked out before several large organizations could mesh their efforts in his plan. The letters he got were pretty noncommittal. Or take another example. In a major school-university project the school authorities decided upon the location of the project's headquarters without a word of advance consultation with the universities. The universities' representatives didn't challenge the decision. But they dismayed and hurt the public school authorities by challenging the unconstrained manner in which the decision had been made without reference to numerous professional persons affected by it.

Such is the special kind of administration found in our school systems, and such are some of the consequences that flow from it. What do they say about the readiness of our school systems to adapt to, or, better yet, lead in, the rapid changes our society is now undergoing?

## III. CHANGES BEARING DOWN ON THE SCHOOLS

Our society is being transformed before our eyes by the enormously rapid growth of knowledge, of wealth, of population, of urban concentration, of specialization in occupational life, and of formal and informal bureaucratization of many facets of society. The last three of the changes listed are steadily replacing our independence one of another with mutual interdependence and reducing our physical separateness from one another, to jam us together in a myriad mutual contacts. These developments force us to define our respective places more clearly, to arrive at agreements as to what each of us may and may not do, and to devise procedures both for keeping us from treading on each other's toes and for keeping us in close communication with one another. In the rural society it might not have been necessary to have any rule on the road; in today's traffic we even need a procedure for changing the rules for this lane or that depending upon the circumstances. Our inevitable concern about defining our respective places is most dramatically reflected, of course, in the enormous number of cases now being taken to the courts.

Another obvious social trend, related to these changes in ways not wholly clear, is the growing concern with justice, due process of law, fair play for each individual, in short civil liberties. It is within the lifetime of many of us here that in the case of _Near vs. Minnesota_ the Supreme Court first spelled out the legal basis for freedom of the press. And we all have experienced the desegregation decisions, the civil rights acts, the reapportionment decisions, the prayer decisions, and the decisions on the right to have counsel. Through all of these there runs the same thread: the defining of our respective places in our complicated world is to be done within frameworks which guarantee fair play for all, with the irrelevant biases or personal preferences of those in authority so far as possible excluded.

The third trend that must be mentioned is one that concerns education in particular and that is still in its infancy: the trend toward massive cooperation between all sorts of social institutions having a concern with education or a contribution to make to it. It is apparent that in the coming decades the public will no longer expect the public school systems to carry the whole burden of elementary and secondary education, in fact will not allow them to, but will insist on their being closely involved with state and federal education agencies, with private schools, with colleges and universities, and with organizations and corporations in the private sector. All the new federal legislation and many of the foundations' policies make this clear.

## IV. THE INADEQUACIES OF UNCONSTRAINED ADMINISTRATION

Every one of the changes mentioned above seems to fly in the face of the continued practice of unconstrained administration. Defining everyone's place and duties more precisely, keeping close communications going from each position to each other position, and providing guarantees of fair play to all--these things require constraints or, as they often appear, fetters. The changes taking place in our society seem to call for an end to each of the practices listed earlier as characteristic of unconstrained administration.

Does this mean that our school systems must inevitable choke in regulations, standard operating procedures, and requirements of clearance?

It may have this result. But there is abundant evidence, I believe, that it need not. And this evidence lies in the results of the very studies which have been conducted in recent years by members of this organization and their colleagues at other institutions and by others interested in administrative theory and practice. For those studies indicated that bureaucratic organization can enhance the effectiveness of large organization and bring to bear efficiently on its undertaking the contributions of a variety of generalists and specialists. The insights into organizational theory which have been accumulating over the past few decades have been concerned chiefly with releasing the energies and talent of the employees so as to bring about greater productivity. Applied to school systems, this means better education.

Well-conceived constraining of the school administrator does not diminish but increases his effectiveness. It protects him and the whole organization from weaknesses such as those we have noted to be prevalent in school systems. Well-conceived constraining of administrative practice replaces the funneling-down system with a system of interconnections and interdependencies. Such a system can allow each member of the organization to contribute what he is peculiarly qualified to contribute while still reserving to the superordinate the authority to adjudicate when disagreement becomes serious. Finally, judging from one study (CASEA, _Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences_, p. 78), intelligent bureaucratization seems to improve the morale of those serving in a school system.

Thus it seems that school systems would do well to introduce more bureaucratization into their administrative procedures if only to improve education. The social changes taking place all around them simply point out their need to move rapidly in the direction in which school administration ought to go anyway.

# THE RELEVANCE OF VALUES TO PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH

Richard E. Worthen

Values concern what an individual or group considers to be desirable or proper. In this sense, individual or cultural values are the basis of choices concerning good and bad, right and wrong. Values are conceptions of the desirable, distinctive of an individual or group which influences choices from available means, modes and ends of action (16). Values become institutionalized when they are common to a family, ethnic group or an organization. Value-orientations can be specific to certain situations such as "It is right for women to wear shorts to the market, but not to the movies." Or, the value-orientation can be general as indicated in a statement such as "Women should never wear shorts."

It is interesting to note that some values are universally held, according to Kluckhohn (15). He says no society has ever approved of suffering as a good thing in itself. No society approves of killing in itself, lying or stealing. Rape is universally disapproved. It is interesting to observe these universally-held values, but the justification for different actions, when committed, varies a great deal according to the culture. Although it is worthy to consider values as absolute, attempts of philosophers, theologians and other thoughtful men to seek absolute values have proved confusing. Values are essentially relative -- not only to the culture but also to the diverse varieties of human nature in history and relative to opportunities and limitations of human situations. For example, the warrior virtues were important to the traditional Sioux, but for the reservation Sioux they no longer make any sense (17). Among psychologists, there is a consensus that values refer to implicit and explicit standards for choices and evaluations. It is with this conception that the importance of values to psychology will be discussed.

Matters concerning values generally have been considered outside of scientific circles. This is because science has generally taken the position that the findings of science are neither good nor bad, right nor wrong, in themselves. The use to which scientific findings are put, scientists have felt, are determined by values not implicit in the findings. Generally speaking, science is considered to be the activity of grouping facts under concepts which are judged by the outcome of actions based on these concepts. The aim of science seems to be to discover "what is," not "what ought to be." Concepts change in light of new evidence and are built and rebuilt to fit empirical evidence. Science is directed to seek truth, truth which conforms to facts as they are or to "what is."

Alsobrook (3), however, states, "We find science influenced by the values of the scientist in choosing a problem and a methodology, choosing his field of endeavor, the way he uses his native ability, the selectivity of his perception, the variables that are relevant to him, the scientific causes he espouses, the interpretation of his data, etc.; and important to the scientist himself is the value he feels in his own experience." Waters (27) indicates that neither theorists, therapists nor teachers can attend to everything equally. Some of us maintain that values are an important determinant of the stimuli to which a person, including the scientist, pays attention.

In the past few years more and more psychologists have indicated that the study of values is important to psychology--especially clinical psychology. Many psychologists have a difficult time avoiding problems related to values. Brammer and Shostrom say, "Many clients, in effect, beg the counselor to tell them how to live, what kind of person they should be, how they can meet the vicissitudes and seeming meaninglessness of life. Frequently clients expect the counselor to relieve them of basic anxieties such as fear of nonbeing or death" (6: 383).

American education has, to a great degree, drawn on psychology for the formulation of its goals; so some psychologists, at least, have to grapple with conceptions of optimal human functioning. It has been difficult for some to avoid facing these problems. If psychologists remain aloof from values, then they become observers of behavior and remain uninvolved with the direction it takes. If one takes the observer position, then he would not be interested in improving things for an individual, but only in whether the individual (organism) behaved in a particular manner under particular conditions. In either case, one would be required to know a great deal about values, but the pure observer could keep from getting involved. To be concerned with the best choice rather than just which choice, a social or behavioral scientist must have courage to take a position concerning values conducive to optimal psychological health.

In terms of our values we single out a few from many possibilities for the developing child and ignore the infinite variety of other developmental trends that could be actualized. Psychologists could accept the values of the culture and let others make value choices. But everyone has a right to posit values and a right to persuade others to his way of valuing. If one wished to persuade another to value something in the same way as he does, he can either: (1) open the other person's eyes to new ways of seeing things, or (2) show the person that the position he takes on a particular value conflicts with other values to which he is committed. The behavioral scientist is particularly qualified to display the causal network in which the value choice is imbedded. It would, however, be ridiculous to assume that everyone would agree on the same choices. This is indicated by the experience of the Cornell conference. To quote from the conference report:

> Everyone at Cornell seemed to agree that the good life for all was to be desired. They split, however, on what that good life was--as they had split on the definition of mental health, and they split on who, if anyone, should have the right to "impose" it on others (20: 20).

Much appears to be gained from psychological study of the empirical antecedents, consequences, and interrelations of realizing different values in the sphere of personality. From a study of optimal human functioning, psychology can increase its knowledge about ways and means of attaining values which are agreed upon. Factual relationships which bear upon choices made can be clarified. This would help build a bridge between what C. P. Snow (24) has called the two cultures of the scientists and the humanistic intellectuals.

Friendliness and understanding have grown between different racial groups where mutual cultural interests such as music, theater and sports have been involved and where there has been joint participation in a task (2). Studies cited by Sorokin (25) indicate that love and affection are necessary to maximum happiness, even to survival in some cases. To merely give "lip service" is ineffective. He further indicated that where brotherhood and love are not only preached but practiced, the number of juvenile problems and disturbed personalities is low. Donald A. Glad (11) observed in a study of different psychotherapeutic methods that it was not the particular technique used that made for successful treatment but how well the client adopted the values of the therapist. Harvard and Radcliffe students' relationships were changed, in an experiment, from an unfriendly, hostile one to a friendly one through "good deeds" rendered by one subject to another. The worst enemy of each subject was traced to someone who had initiated an aggressive action (25).

Piaget (22) in 1951 conducted a study with Swiss children as subjects. Before the age of ten, the children were unable to consider themselves both Genevese and Swiss. They would draw two circles side by side to indicate their position of Genevese in relation to Swiss. Decentering, for them, began to take place after ten. They included themselves in a larger social circle. They were unable, however, to conceive of any supranational grouping until the age of fourteen.

Maslow (18) as a result of research says there are good choosers and bad choosers. Some qualities of a good chooser are: clear perception of reality, lack of prejudice, firm identity, spontaneity, expressiveness, ability to love, and the ability to handle stress. Some qualities of a bad chooser are: inability to enjoy life, guilt feelings, lack of identity and little ability to handle stress. Maslow feels that through good choosers, values can be found which will be beneficial to all men.

There is a large body of research evidence that schizophrenia, in addition to whatever else it may be, is an impairment of social understanding and participation. Dale L. Johnson (13) made an exploratory study concerning the moral judgment of schizophrenics. He used Baruk's Tsedek Test of Moral Judgment (5). Their views reflected tendencies toward social detachment, a mechanical view of interpersonal relationships, egocentric self-concern and the influence of adapting to a constraining social environment. By comparing the dominant values in the culture with groups of psychiatric patients he indicated that a study of values and value patterns can suggest many profitable areas in the study of personality disturbances. In particular, the values of the patients are more egocentric and less socially controlled. The data, however, discloses no general relation between the severity of personality disturbance and the divergence of one's value patterns. The data indicate a linking of the severity of disturbance with the amount of value conflict held by the disturbed person. The conflicts themselves do not lead to disturbance, it seems, as much as the inability to handle these conflicts. Many persons without disturbed personalities seem to have just as many conflicts as the patient studied. It may be that the least disturbed person can more easily laugh at the incongruities of his culture, whereas the more disturbed personality seriously tries to make sense out of the disharmonious values in the culture.

The kind of personality disturbance that develops is related to the values one holds. For example, an obessive compulsive shows little extroverted activity or sensuous enjoyment but rather stresses self-control, a turn toward intellectual matters and emotional withdrawal. Some persons classified as paranoid schizophrenics show a strong intellectual tendency which is in line with their propensity for ideational thinking. This often assumes delusional proportions, caution and over-control--which are related to their suspiciousness. In undisturbed personalities there appear to be more value judgments emphasizing justice, mutual respect, reciprocity in human relations and sympathetic understanding (13). To some extent a person's identifications on Kelly's Rep Test are indications of an acceptance of others and a willingness to communicate or have social intercourse (27). But over-identifications and under-identifications are associated with an over-simplified value-laden construct system. When a person polarizes his world into social objects hated and social objects idealized, relevant dimensions of perception become inoperant, the self ceases to develop and leads to differentiation into "all good" or "all bad" (14).

Frankl's concept of noogenic neurosis arises as a feeling of complete emptiness or purpose in life. Frankl feels the essence of human motivation is the "will to meaning." When meaning is not found, the individual becomes existentially frustrated (1, 10). Gough (12), using the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), found indications that the constructive use of talent is a value problem and not a motivational, ambition, study habits or a what-you-will problem. O'Donovan (21) indicates that apathy and indifference bear a relationship to effective functioning, particularly interpersonal functioning. Further, he asserts that indifference or the lack of valuing is related to interpersonal problems.

The interrelationships between personality, culture and values are complex. The psychologist who is interested not only in looking and understanding but also in mental health is concerned with reshaping altering, and amending. His aim is not only diagnosis but also therapeutic activity in a broad category. Successful personality functioning requires one to take care of value changes fostered at a rapid rate in our culture. When an individual is required to give up or exchange values, his personality mechanisms are involved. Successful value adjustment is essentially the personality's ability to make compromises. Not all compromises are directed toward optimum functioning, and the number of compromises one is capable of making seems limited. Buxton (7) states:

> . . . the goal of liberative education seeks . . . to free the individual from rigid, habitual, or biased modes of thought, to help him to explore many realms of knowledge and activity, and lead him to cherish the pleasures and responsibilities of such freedoms . . . A liberally educated person is one who has examined or begun to examine his own values or those of society in order to judge which ones are important or worthy of support.

Some psychologists still reflect an ambivalence reminiscent of earlier days when value was rigidly excluded from the study of man's behavior, but many theorists today assign values a principle role in personality development and function (1, 4, 8, 19, 23, 26). Should it be the concern of psychology (or a part of it) to oppose in word and deed the values which are detrimental to optimal personality development? The physicist has seen the use to which his knowledge can be applied. Can the psychologist permit the perpetuation of personality and cultural disturbance by not looking more closely at the relevance of values?

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, Gordon W. Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Holt, 1937.

2. ______. "Prejudice: A Problem in Psychological and Social Causation," in Toward a General Theory of Action, Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

3. Alsobrook, J. Some Ideas Concerning the Psychological Study of Values. Unpublished manuscript. University of Florida, 1960.

4. Asch, S. E. Social Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

5. Baruk, H., and Backet, M. Le Test "Tsedek," le Judgment Moral et la Delinquence. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950.

6. Brammer, L. M., and Shostrum, E. L. Therapeutic Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

7. Buxton, C. E. College Teaching: A Psychologist's View. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1956.

8. Dukes, W. F. "Psychological Studies of Values," Psychological Bulletin 52: 24-50; 1955.

9. Frankl, V. E. "Beyond Self-Actualization and Self-Expression," Journal of Existential Psychiatry 1: 5-20; 1960.

10. ______. "The Will to Meaning," Journal of Pastoral Care 12: 82-88; 1958.

11. Glad, Donald O. Operational Values in Psychotherapy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

12. Gough, G. G. "Theory and Measurement of Socialization," Journal of Consulting Psychology 24: 23-30; 1960.

13. Johnson, Dale L. "The Moral Judgment of Schizophrenics," The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease 130: 278-285; 1960.

14. Jones, Robert E. Identification in Terms of Personal Constructs: Reconciling a Paradox in Theory. Unpublished manuscript. Veterans Administration Hospital, Danville, Illinois.

15. Kluckhohn, Clyde, and Murray, Henry A. (eds.), with David M. Scheinder. *Personality in Nature, Society and Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knoph, 1956.

16. Kluckhohn, Clyde. "Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action: An Exploration in Definition and Classification," in *Toward a General Theory of Action*, Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils (eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

17. MacGregor, G. *Warriors Without Weapons*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1946.

18. Maslow, Abraham, "Psychological Data and Value Theory," Ch. 10 in *New Knowledge in Human Values*, A. Maslow (ed.). New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.

19. Murphy, Gardner. *Personality*. New York: Harper, 1947.

20. National Assembly on Mental Health Education. *Mental Health Education: A Critique*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Mental Health, Inc., 1960.

21. O'Donovan, Denis. *The Scientific Study of Human Values*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Missouri, 1960.

22. Piaget, J. *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951.

23. Rogers, C. R. *Client Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implication, and Theory*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

24. Snow, C. P. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

25. Stagner, R. *Psychology of Personality* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.

26. Waters, R. H. "Behavior: Datum or Abstraction," *American Psychology*. 13: 278-282; 1958.

# NOTES FROM THE TWO SESSIONS OF THE CONTINUING INTEREST GROUP ON VALUES, TUCSON, ARIZONA, AUGUST 1967

C. Robert Blackmon

Recording Secretary, Continuing Interest Group on Values

During the two sessions seventeen members of the Group held some excitingly free-wheeling discussions arising from the presentation of three papers: "Values, Perception, and Leadership Behavior" by Chairman Benjamin M. Sachs; "Values" by Secretary Bob Blackmon; and "Values, Psychology, and Existence" by Richard Worthen (not present). Other points for discussion were introduced from the floor.

On Tuesday afternoon the topics included:

1) the possibility of arriving at some basic, universal human needs;

2) the possibility of establishing some basic values commensurate with a democratic society; and,

3) the possibility of analyzing personality factors which are compatible with democracy and which are antithetical to the democratic way of life.

On Thursday afternoon the following discussions took place:

1) a continuation of personality factors and values;

2) consideration of some implications for training programs for administrators; and,

3) some questions raised concerning the papers presented at the first session.

Throughout both sessions the discussions were interspersed with considerations of (1) some observable behavioral characteristics which operate within the value structures described above and (2) methods of establishing practices commensurate with the present and future needs in our democratic society.

The Group authorized Dr. Blackmon to pull together and edit a related publication. The Group agreed to request the NCPEA Planning Committee to consider values as a theme for a future NCPEA session.

In a publication which will appear subsequent to the presentation of this booklet to the NCPEA at the Albany Conference in August, 1968, both the two tapes of the two afternoon sessions in Tucson in 1967 and the tapes from the two sessions in Albany will be transcribed, edited, and disseminated to interested NCPEA members. Anyone wishing to receive a copy should write to Dr. Blackmon.

Roster of Participants of One or Both Sessions, Tucson--1967

Dr. Waldo Anderson, College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721
Dr. Charles A. Bird, Director of Graduate Studies, School of Education, Fordham University, 302 Broadway, New York, New York 10007
Dr. Leroy Bishop, 553 N. Serrano Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90004
Dr. C. Robert Blackmon, Recording Secretary, Continuing Interest Group on Values, NCPEA, 1206 Lee Avenue, Lafayette, Louisiana 70501
Dr. George Brower, Professor of Education, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
Dr. Deane Fowler, College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721
Dr. Warren Franzen, 4826 E. Bermuda, Tucson, Arizona 85716
Dr. R. L. Granger, Education, New York University, Washington Square, New York, New York 10003
Dr. F. E. Henzlick, 930 Andora Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Mr. Harold Hunnicutt, College of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, 85821
Dr. Lyle L. Mullens, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Dr. Joseph P. Owens, Professor of Education, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio 44118
Dr. Harry E. Randles, Educational Administration, 218 Slocum Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210
Dr. Gale Rose, Educational Administration, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Dr. Carl Roseveare, Educational Administration, Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Washington 98119

Mr. Walt St. John, College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721

Dr. Benjamin M. Sachs, Professor of Educational Administration, Sacramento State College, 6000 Jay Street, Sacramento, California 95819 (Chairman, Continuing Interest Group on Values, NCPEA)

Dr. Fred Straub, College of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dr. Philip C. Wells, Professor of Education, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois 60115

Dr. R. L. Whitt, College of Education, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa 50311

Dr. Richard Williams, 353-A Moore Hall, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90004

# A PRELIMINARY REPORT OF DATA FROM A SURVEY OF PROFESSORS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION CONCERNING VALUES

C. Robert Blackmon

Associate Professor of Education
University of Southwestern Louisiana

The members of the Continuing Interest Group on Values (an informal sub-group of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration) have been concerned for the past three years with a study of values in relation to educational administration, the personality of educational administrators, and decision-making. This survey was an attempt to seek a small footing in the verbal ooze for more empirical undertakings.

The mailing list consisted of participants of the 1966 Indiana University and 1967 University of Arizona National Conferences of NCPEA. One female and 151 male members of NCPEA were requested to give a few minutes to completion of the following seven-page, objective-type questionnaire. One hundred one did so, a return of approximately 66.5 per cent. However, since several were relatively incomplete, only 97 returns were considered usable. Six of the 152 packets mailed were returned for lack of better addresses. Also, three respondents mailed their forms in too late for inclusion in this study. One questionnaire was returned blank. Therefore, out of the frame of 152, there were forty non-respondents (26.5 per cent). While a higher percentage of returns would have been desirable, one may conclude that the responses reported here have a good chance of being representative of the total NCPEA membership.

However, just what constitutes the membership of NCPEA is a difficult thing to state precisely. NCPEA has prided itself for years on being a relatively unstructured organization with a rather democratic operational pattern.

Despite the foregoing, a somewhat shifting but discernible "peck-order" is, this writer believes, observable. Therefore, one of the assumptions concerning this group was that, because of certain selection factors in operation, the members of the group would be less diverse in backgrounds and attitudes than one would suppose at first glance. WOULD THAT RELATIVE HOMOGENEITY, if it does exist, BE TRUE ALSO OF THEIR BELIEFS CONCERNING VALUES? In other words, would not some knowledge of the nature and structure of the group be useful in interpreting their responses to questions concerning their values and beliefs concerning values?

Since the members of the NCPEA individually and collectively play such an important role in the preparation of our nation's educational administrators, the Continuing Interest Group wondered: " Are the professors aware of and sensitive to values?" I. e., would there be any important differences concerning values between the responses of publicly-educated and non-publicly-educated professors? between those educated mainly in the Midwest and those educated mainly in the Mid-Atlantic states? between professors who regard themselves as inner-directed and those who regard themselves as other-directed?, etc.

That the members of the NCPEA are more knowledgeable about and sensitive to values than are practicing administrators was one of the assumptions of this study. It is hoped that, after analysis of this study data, that assumption may be tested in the future by comparison of these data with the data from a similar survey of practicing administrators. Perhaps that study will indicate then directions for further studies designed to illuminate some of the relationships between formation and operation of value-structures and administrative behavior.

Therefore, the data and this preliminary report are presented below in a seminal spirit for the study of the Continuing Interest Group on Values and other interested parties. By the next annual conference of this group an analysis of these data, and perhaps related further studies, should have been completed. In the meantime the reader is invited to consider the following data.

A Request for Data Concerning Educational Administrators and Their

# VALUES

Part of a Study by the Continuing Interest Group on Values, The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration.

I. Degrees held by Correspondent (fill-in or check — as appropriate):

| | | 1 bachelor's | 2 master's | 3 adv. master's | 4 doctorate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1. Major: (SEE TABLES | FOLLOWING | THIS ITEM | ; BELOW.) | |
| C | 2. State: | 54 | 68 | 1 | 70 |
| O | 3. Parochial (or | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| L | 4. Church Related): | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| L | 5. Private: | 13 | 21 | 1 | 23 |
| E | Year Received: | | | | |
| G | 6. before 1910 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| E | 7. 1911-1920 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 8. 1921-1930 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 2 |
| | 9. 1931-1940 | 25 | 12 | 0 | 2 |
| | 10. 1941-1950 | 31 | 28 | 2 | 13 |
| | 11. 1951-1960 | 23 | 35 | 3 | 42 |
| | 12. 1960-1965 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 26 |
| | 13. 1966-present | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

The responses to questions on degree majors (Item I) were:

| Degree | Major Field | |
|---|---|---|
| Bachelor's | Social studies | 18 |
| | English | 7 |
| | Vocational education | 3 |
| | Elementary education | 2 |
| | Education | 2 |
| | Science | 2 |
| | Physical education | 1 |
| | Psychology | 1 |
| | Pre-medicine | 1 |
| | N= | 44 |
| Master's | Educational administration and supervision | 28 |
| | Social studies | 5 |
| | Education | 3 |
| | Vocational education | 1 |
| | English | 1 |
| | Zoology | 1 |
| | N= | 39 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Doctorate | Educational administration and supervision | 32 |
| | Education | 8 |
| | Higher Education | 1 |
| | Sociology | 1 |
| | N= | 42* |

* As can be seen from the totals above, approximately one-half of the respondents were non-readers who merely checked the blank that they had a major but did not indicate what that major was.

The data indicate that a disproportionate number of the respondents majored in social studies for the baccalaureate degree; but, by the time they earned the master's, most had switched to education as a major. Although interesting, it is as expected that only two earned the doctorate in other fields. Therefore, the data indicate a relative homogeneity of academic degree background for the membership.

II. Experience in Elementary or Secondary School (Please place a number in each square to indicate years in that position.):

| | PUBLIC | | PAROCHIAL: or church-related | | PRIVATE | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 elem. | 2 sec'y | 3 elem. | 4 sec'y | 5 elem. | 6 sec'y |
| 14. teacher | 2.5 | 4.4 | 0 | 4.75 | 2.7 | 3 |
| 15. dean or | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16. asst. prin. | 0 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17. guid. coun. | 1.5 | 2.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18. principal | 4.1 | 3.2 | 0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 5 |
| 19. superv'r | 1 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. asst. supt. | 4.8 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. supt. | 8.6 | 7.4 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Other: (Please name) (SEE BELOW.) | 2 | 6.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

In Item II, No. 22, the following were entered as other types of experience in elementary or secondary school:

| | |
|---|---|
| Elementary-public | 0 |
| Secondary- public | 8 |
| Parochial, church-related, private | 0 |

Interesting is the listing of 12 superintendents in parochial or church-related schools with relatively little teaching experience (or in other position other than teaching with the exception of few who were principals for a short time).

III. Experience in Higher Education (Indicate years in each position in appropriate squares and please indicate your present position with an X, also):

| | COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 PUBLIC | 2 PAROCHIAL or church-related | 3 PRIVATE |
| 23. grad. asst. | 1.8 | 0 | 1.7 |
| 24. instructor | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.5 |
| 25. asst. prof. | 2.9 | 2.0 | 3.6 |
| 26. assoc. prof. | 3.5 | 2.7 | 4.6 |
| 27. professor | 6.9 | 5.7 | 6.0 |
| 28. dept. head | 3.9 | 0 | 2.4 |
| 29. Div. head | 5.8 | 7.0 | 4.0 |
| 30. Dean of College | 5.4 | 0 | 4.3 |
| 31. Other * | 3.7 | 5.0 | 3.5 |

* See below.

* Responses to Other in Item III, No. 31, included the following:

| Public | | Parochial or Church-Related | Private |
|---|---|---|---|
| Asst. Dean of Grad. Col. | - 3 | Dean of Men - 5 | Assoc. Dean- 5 |
| Academic Dean | - 3 | | Visiting Prof. -2 |
| Dean Emeritus | - 3 | | |
| Ass't to Dean | -10 | | |
| Assoc. Dean | -18 | | |
| Assoc. Dean of Col. | - 5 | | |
| Visitor | - 1 | | |
| Post-Doctoral Fellow | - 1 | | |
| Dean of Junior College | - 1 | | |

NOTE: Some of the ranks and administrative positions may overlap because they were held simultaneously by the same person.

IV. Other Experience in Education (Indicate years in each position in appropriate squares and please indicate your present position with an X, also)

32. 9 1. full-time position with a professional education organization (X= 2)

2.3 . state department of education position (X = 3)

3.2 3. federal position in education (X = 1)

6.5 4. commercial or business position (X = 0)

1.3 5. foundation position (X =0 )

4.3 6. Explain position not categorized above: (X = 4)
SEE LISTING BELOW

The explanations of Item IV, No. 32 (6.), included the following:

Director of Research, American School Publishing Corp.
Educational Consultant with Architectural Firm.
United States Army ( 7 years: 1939-1946).
Foreign Aid Program of U. S. (AID) in Education.
Priest, Roman Catholic Church, 1948 to present, Jesuit Order.
Teacher and Principal - high school.
Managing Editor - The School Executive Magazine.
Director of Research Studies - State Administrative Council.
Post-Doctoral Fellow in Educational Administration.
State School Association Regional Accrediting Agency.
Executive Secretary School Study Council.
Instructor in Army Air Force.
Educational facilities consultant with firm of school architects.
Two years as chief of party of USA-A. I. D. contract team in an overseas assignment for a state university.
Sales Representative for F. E. Compton Co. Encyclopedias.
Superintendent of Schools.
Assistant to University President.

V. Religious Preference: ( N = 98)

33. 3 1. Agnostic ( 3 %)
0 2. Atheist
6 3. Catholic (6.1%)
4 4. Jewish (4.1%)
2 5. None (2.0%)
72 6. Protestant (73.5%)
11 7. Other: (11.3%) SEE LIST BELOW.
(Please name)

Preferences expressed in Item V, No. 7, under Other were:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mormon (L. D. S.) | 3 |
| Unitarian/Universalist | 5 |
| Greek Orthodox | 1 |
| Checked but not identified | 2 |

VI. Age:

34. 0 1. below 30
7 2. 31-35 (7.2%)
19 3. 36-40 (19.6%)
17 4. 41-45 (17.5%)
18 5. 46-50 (17.8%)
12 6. 51-55 (12.3%)
9 7. 56-60 (9.3%)
8 8. 61-65 (8.2%)
7 9. 66 plus (7.2%)

VII. Birth: (Please check in appropriate squares)

| | 1 New Eng. | 2 Mid-Atlan. States | 3 South-east | 4 Mid-west | 5 South-west | 6 North-west | 7 Other: (Explain) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35. Born in | 1 | 9 | 8 | 52 | 10 | 4 | 4 |
| 36. Educated mostly in | 1 | 12 | 8 | 56 | 10 | 4 | 2 |
| 37. Most of experience in ed. in | 1 | 10 | 5 | 58 | 20 | 2 | 3 |
| 38. Presently live in | 2 | 11 | 6 | 39 | 29 | 4 | 1 |

*SEE BELOW.

Under Item VII, Other included:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 35. Place of birth: | Canada | 3 |
| | Hungary | 1 |
| 36. Educated mostly in: | Canada | 2 |
| 37. Most of experience in education in: | Canada | 1 |
| | Europe | 1 |
| | Viet Nam | 1 |
| 38. Presently live in: | Checked but unnamed: | 1 |

VIII. Philosophy: (Check only one) (N = 95)

I consider my social philosophy to be:

39. 0 1. undeveloped.

5 2. conservative. (5.3%)

40 3. moderate. (42.2%)

49 4. liberal. (51.5%)

0 5. radical.

___ 6. eclectic (1 %)

(This classification was added.)

IX. Behavior (Check only one) (N = 92 )

I believe that in my behavior* I am:

40. 7 1. tradition-directed (7.7%)

44 2. inner-directed (47.9%)

22 3. other-directed (peer group) (23.8%)

19 4. autonomous (20.6%)

(*Terms taken from Reisman - The Lonely Crowd.)

X. Title: (N = 94)

My present title includes the words "educational administration":

41. 68 1. yes 26 2. no (Yes = 72 %) (No = 28%)

XI. Selected Courses Studied (Please check as appropriate.) (N varied.)

I have had the following courses:

42. 91 1. Ed'l psy.

91 2. Ed'l superv'n.

65 3. Ed'l leadership

37 4. Personality dynamics or theory of personality

56 5. Intro. to philosophy

82 6. Philosophy of educ.

61 7. Learning theory

66 8. Admin. decision-making

46 9. Values (as major emphasis of course)

I have participated in: (check as appropriate) (N varied.)

43. 78 1. in-service leadership education for administrators

25 2. T-groups

28 3. sensitivity training sessions

59 4. graduate leadership seminars

44. The most valuable course to me in understanding the importance of values in education was: ______

(Use the number assigned to one of the courses in the list above or write in the name of the course if not listed above.)

Responses to Item XI, No. 44, included:

| | |
|---|---|
| Philosophy of Education | 19 |
| Administrative Decision-Making | 9 |
| Values | 8 |
| Educational Supervision | 6 |
| None of the items listed in 42. or 43. above | 4 |
| Personality Dynamics | 3 |
| School and Society, etc. | 3 |
| History of Education | 2 |
| Graduate Seminar | 2 |
| Literature (modern and Elizabethan)(Romantic poets) | 3 |
| Learning Theory | 2 |
| One listing for each of the following: | 1 |
| Educational policy development | |
| Administrative theory | |
| Political theory | |
| Introduction to American education | |
| Psychological Research in Education | |
| Psychiatry-Philosophy | |
| Social Psychology | |
| Dissertation on Values of High School Students | |
| Principles of Administration | |
| Graduate assistant to Ernest Melby | |
| Social Philosophy | |

## XII. VALUES

I believe that administrative decisions: (check as many as needed)

45. 76 1. are never value-free.
18 2. are sometimes value-free.
0 3. could be value-free almost always.
11 4. should be as value-free as possible.
35 5. should not be completely value-free.

I believe that the basic or governing values are developed by an individual:

46. 18 1. in infancy.
72 . in early childhood.
23 3. during puberty.
32 4. during adolescence.
28 5. in early adulthood.

Item XII, No. 46 (1.-5.), included the following comment:

Throughout life.

Many basic values are developed in the pre-school years, but many are also developed later.

I am still developing them!

In the order of importance (or effect) in developing or inculcating values, I would rank as the single most effective institution:

| Check One:<br>(listed alphabetically) | RANK<br>1.<br>Most | <br>2.<br>Middle | <br>3.<br>Least |
|---|---|---|---|
| 47. church | 2 | 27 | 57 |
| 48. home | 86 | 8 | 2 |
| 49. school | 8 | 54 | 29 |

I believe that values could be most effectively inculcated by conscious coordination of the institutions noted above in 47., 48., and 49., as follows:

50. 20 1. coordination of 1 and 2 would be most effective. (47 & 48)
5 2. coordination of 1 and 3 would be most effective. (47 & 49)
18 3. coordination of 2 and 3 would be most effective. (48 & 49)
49 4. coordination of 1, 2, and 3 would be most effective. (47,48,49)
7 5. coordination of two or three would make little difference.

I believe that one develops his values and resultant value system mainly as a result of:

| | 1<br>Most | RANK<br>2<br>Middle | 3<br>Least |
|---|---|---|---|
| 51. socio-economic environment | 70 | 16 | 7 |
| 52. intellect | 5 | 24 | 58 |
| 53. education | 19 | 54 | 15 |

I believe that one develops his values and resultant value system mainly as a result of:

54. 6 1. items 51. and 52.
45 2. items 51. and 53.
3 3. items 52. and 53.
39 4. items 51., 52., and 53.
1 5. There is little interaction of items 51., 52., and 53. in the process of developing values or one's value system.

I believe that one's values: (check as needed)

Added comment: "Some values are formed or modified at different ages than are some others."

55. 0 1. cannot be modified
52 2. can be modified
46 3. can be modified significantly
2 4. should not be modified drastically because of the danger of personality disruption.

I believe that the best time to attempt to modify values should be: (check one)

ADDED COMMENT: "My belief includes all of these."

56. 5 1. infancy
58 2. early childhood
6 3. puberty
17 4. adolescence
14 5. early adulthood

On Item XII, No. 56 (1.-5.), this comment was added:

"Best time is now — easier to change attitude at an early age — infancy."

I believe that values are learned and internalized during: (check one)

57. 10 1. infancy
60 2. early childhood
12 3. puberty
19 4. adolescence
12 5. early adulthood

I believe that efforts to significantly modify the values of an individual by external means: (check one)

58. 7 1. are usually ineffective or of short duration in effect.
2 2. are very possibly destructive of personality.
30 3. can be successful but not necessarily permanent.
53 4. can be successful and can be personality enhancing.

ADDED COMMENT: "Individual group environment."

**I believe that the most effective means for modifying values would be: (check one)**

**59. 17 1. Reflective thinking**
**37 2. Cultural conditioning**
**22 3. Association of something with love and approval**
**16 4. Empathic emotional experiences**
**4 5. Satisfaction or thwarting of physiological drives**
**1 6. Reward and punishment**
**0 7. Inculcation by authority**

Added comments included the following:

"No one agreed upon method of developing or modifying our values and values systems."

"Depends on age of person — infant can't be taught values via reflective thinking. All are affected with people at some time or other."

**I believe that when one makes important decisions he is:**

**60. 62 1. aware of some of his basic values.**
**36 2. not aware of some of his basic values.**

**I believe that educational administrators: (check one or more)**

**61. 40 1. can**
**88 2. should be sensitized to values,**
**0 3. do not need to**
**(Check one below, BUT do not check any below if 3. was checked above.**
**29 4. through special programs or projects in training.**
**39 5. within educational leadership courses.**
**8 6. through a special course concerning values**
**14 7. through other means: (Please specify) See list below.**

For Item XII, No. 61 (7.), "Other means" of sensitizing administrators to values were suggested, as follows:

Humanities. Also, Specially designed humanities courses.

The values should be basic themes in all experiences.

Apprenticeship.

Total environment: learning experiences based on "value decisions."

Cultural conditioning.

Would have to get them in childhood or give training of very deep and strong values orientation.

Depends on the individual.

All of the above.

Notably by modeling significant others.

**My definition of values is most nearly stated by: (Check one)**

**62. 1 1. Since no way can be even imagined for deciding a difference as to values, the conclusion is forced upon us that the difference is one of tastes, not one as to any objective truths. (Bertrand Russell)**

**15 2. The concept of the desirable, and its comparative, that of progress, is never absent from human affairs. All conduct implies a consciousness of welfare, of less and greater welfare — we could neither live noract without it. To live is to act, and to act is to choose, and to choose is to evaluate. (R. M. MacIver)**

**17 3. Values may be defined, in one sense, as standards of judgment in human behavior and intimately related to what the individual has come to accept as guiding principles for living. (Fla. St. Dept. of Education)**

**60 4. A value is a motivating force, a selecting factor, an appraising concept which enables us to make choices among alternative paths of action. Values are decisive agents in formulating hypotheses and judging consequences. A value might be said to be the comparative weight, esteem, or price attached by the individual to a given idea, person, or object. (A summary of several definitions — prepared specially for this study.)**

**3 5. None of the above approach an adequate statement of my definition of values.**

**(If you care to do so, please indicate your own definition of values below.)** ( NONE WERE LISTED.)

63. I would suggest that you go to the following article, study, book or authority for further direction in this area of study:

In addition to the specific responses received for this item, the following statement was included: "See those that have been written in the Talcott Parsons tradition. See especially the Harvard Group: Kluckhohn, Strodbeck, Vogt, etc."

Below is a list of other references offered by respondents. The authors marked with an asterisk have been cited in the bibliographies of Blackmon, Sachs, or Worthen in this booklet. The references are presented here as they were offered.

Allport-Vernon-Lindsey, *Study of Values* — see the literature behind this.

Ayers- *Towards a Reasonable Society.*

Brameld* (Theodore) Several works.

Braybrooke and Lindblom, *A Strategy of Decision*. (One respondent felt that this book had been very helpful to him. He stated that "especially regarding some writers' desire to program value judgments into a computer.)

Bronowski - *Human Values* (Harpers).

Dewey, John * (*Democracy and Education* and *Theory of Valuation*.)

DuBois, Cora - *Dominant and Variant Values of the American Culture*.

Frank (or, Frankl ?) - *Society as the Patient*.

Gardner, John W., *Self-Renewal*.
Getzels, J. W. - See work of.
Graf*, Street, Kimbrough, and Dykes.

Hemphill*, Griffiths, and Frederiksen.

Hunt, Mate Graye, *Values Resources Guide*. "It is an annotated guide for elementary school teachers. Interesting. This little book ought to mean something: *to do* — or something *not to do*."

Jacobs - *Changing Values in College*.

Lecky's *Theory of Self-Consistency*.

Lewis, C. S., *The Abolition of Man* (or Reflections on Education with Special Reference to the Teaching of English in the Upper Forms of Schools). New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947. 121 p. Paper. Don't let the title fool you: he discusses the destruction of the human personality when the point of programming values into humans is reached.

Maslow, Abraham Harold - *Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences.* Columbus, O.: Ohio State University Press, 1964.

Ohm and Monahan (eds.) - *Educational Administration - Philosophy in Action.* (Norman, Okla.: College of Education, University of Oklahoma, 1965).

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*, 1967.

Prince, Richard, "Individual Values and Administrative Effectiveness," Administrator's Notebook VI: 1-4; no. 4, December 1957 (Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago).

Raths - *Values and Teaching.*

Rose, Gale.*

Sachs, Benjamin M.*

Spronger's *Types of Men.*

Barr, Stringfellow - *Let's Join the Human Race.*

*Summerhill* - see regarding modification of values.

Taba, Hilda - *Curriculum Development.*

Williams - *Value Orientations.*

## Conclusions

The data presented is interpreted by this writer as supporting the early assumption that the membership of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration would be relatively homogeneous in background, education, and values concepts. The membership was educated in the Midwest predominately and has had most of its teaching experience there. Most of the members who earned degrees as undergraduates in areas other than education did so with social studies majors. Nearly all of the master's degrees and all but two of the doctorates were earned in education. Approximately three-quarters of the membership reporting listed the doctorate as their highest degree, with most of those earned since

1951. Only eight respondents had earned the educational specialist or advanced master's degrees. Better than one-half of the bachelor's degrees were earned in state institutions; two were earned in parochial colleges, 27 in church-related schools, and about one-tenth in private institutions. The respondents had had relatively little experience in other than public schools. Most of the public school experience tended to be in the secondary levels. The greatest diversity to be found in the group was in the many and varied positions which they had held in both rank and function. That diversity was further emphasized by the long list of non-education (but education-related) positions which the members hold currently (or have held) outside of the usual positions in education.

The group was quite homogeneous in their religious preferences: Protestant, 73 per cent; Other, 11 per cent, and Catholic, 6 per cent. The age level of the group included 69 per cent within the 36-55 year range.

Although the membership categorized itself as approximately 48 per cent "inner-directed" and approximately 24 per cent "other-directed," after Reisman's definitions of those terms, they also listed themselves as liberal (51 per cent) and moderate (42 per cent) in their philosophies.

The group seems to be relatively well-identified with educational administration. Approximately 68 per cent reported that their present title includes the words "educational administration."

Members of the group indicated the course experiences most frequently pursued were: educational psychology (91 respondents), educational supervision (91), and philosophy of education (82). The courses with a major emphasis on values were pursued by only 46 professors, next to the low number of 37 for personality dynamics or theory of personality. This would seem to indicate that the courses in educational supervision and philosophy of education would be the most likely ones in which to attempt emphasis upon values and values sensitization. Although only 65 responded that they had had a course in educational leadership, 78 said they had taken part in in-service leadership education for administrators; also, 59 had taken part in graduate seminars in leadership.

The group not only felt that administrative decisions are never value-free (76) but also indicated that many (35) thought that such decisions should not be value-free.

Seventy-two of the respondents felt that basic or governing values are developed by an individual in early childhood. The remainder of the group split rather evenly among the choices of puberty, adolescence, infancy (the least) and early adulthood. (What does this tell us about the stand administrators should take on supporting or promoting kindergartens and a careful development of those programs with the above beliefs in mind?) The professors saw the home as the most influential in values development, with the school and the church approximately tied in second place in importance. They felt that the job could be done best by a careful coordination of all three agencies.

The group of professors responding felt that socio-economic environment was probably the single most influential variable or factor in the development of one's values structure or system, with intellect and education as least and middle in importance, respectively. They felt that the interaction of socio-economic environment and education produced the most effect on values development. Approximately one-half of the respondents thought that all three of the factors had almost as much effect as socio-economic environment and education. Most of the respondents felt that education as an isolated factor was probably the least effective.

The professors believed that values can be modified and modified significantly. No one expressed the belief that one's values cannot be modified, and only two respondents expressed the belief that one's values should be modified drastically because of the danger of personality disruption. The majority of the group felt that efforts to modify the values of an individual by external means can be successful and can be personality enhancing (53), while 30 felt that such efforts could be successful but not necessarily permanent. The group felt that the following methods would be most effective as means of modifying values: cultural conditioning (37), association of something with love and approval (22), reflective thinking (17), and empathic emotional experiences. These responses would tend to indicate that different values are formed at different age levels and that perhaps we are beginning rather late when we consider the inculcation of values in some of the courses in which it is now attempted in our schools.

While most of the group believed that one is aware of some of his basic values when he makes important decisions, he is not aware of some of those basic values within the process. The group felt that educational administrators should be sensitized to values (88) and felt that it could best be done within educational leadership courses and through special projects or programs for training. (See also the list of suggested methods or techniques on page 97 of this booklet.)

While three of the group did not find among the suggested definitions of values one which they felt comfortable with, 60 of the group picked No. 4 (see page 97), the longer and perhaps most academic definition adapted for this study from several other definitions, particularly the one used by the Florida State Department of Education in its curriculum guide for the teaching of moral and spiritual values in the public schools. Definition No. 2 received 15 votes and No. 3 received 17 votes. No one chose to write in his own definition of values. One may conclude from this section that there is entirely too much variation in the definition of the term to permit relative precision in discussion. Perhaps this is an area that needs immediate attention of study groups.

In short, because of their common heritage and educational experiences, this group may have many assumed and unexpressed values which need to be examined openly before the group can move forward in the study of values in regard to educational administrators, their personalities, and decision-making.